

The Review of English Studies

VOL. X.—No. 38.

APRIL, 1934.

UNPUBLISHED LETTERS FROM THEODORE WATTS-DUNTON TO SWINBURNE

By HERBERT G. WRIGHT

In the year 1872 Swinburne's affairs were in a very unsatisfactory state. He was financially embarrassed and overwhelmed by bills from his creditors. Still worse, in some respects, he was involved in difficulties with his publisher Hotten. Apparently he had begun by dealing with him as a bookseller and afterwards permitted him to act as his publisher. Their transactions had been carried out in an unbusinesslike fashion, as may be seen from the circumstances connected with an edition of Chapman's works which Hotten proposed to issue. Swinburne agreed to write an introduction and lent him all the early copies of Chapman which he possessed, many of them rare and valuable, but although years passed by without anything coming of the scheme, the poet took no steps to recover his books. However, Swinburne grew dissatisfied with Hotten on other grounds and was inclined to leave him for Messrs. Ellis and Green. Hotten immediately put forward a claim to publish not only the volumes already under his charge but all future work written by Swinburne. Messrs. Ellis and Green were unwilling to proceed with the publication of *Songs before Sunrise* while the threat of an action hung over them, and so Swinburne's friend, Charles Augustus Howell, was authorised to negotiate with the troublesome Hotten. The dispute was submitted to arbitration, and in 1871 the book was published by Messrs. Ellis and Green.

For all that, Swinburne was still not free from the entanglement, and, in addition, complications were about to arise out of the publication of his

work in America. Everything pointed to his need of a shrewd man of business. The right person was found in Theodore Watts, to whom, for the sake of convenience, we shall give the name of Watts-Dunton which he afterwards adopted. They became acquainted through Ford Madox Brown, who in 1872 urged Swinburne to take Watts-Dunton as his legal adviser. "Nothing very definite came of this," says Sir Edmund Gosse, "until, in the autumn of the following year, Swinburne moved into rooms at 3 Great James Street. . . . He had some difficulty in getting free from earlier liabilities, and Watts . . . now stepped in with the proffer of professional advice, which was accepted." In point of fact, the letters which we are about to print show that one year before the date indicated by Sir Edmund, while Swinburne was still residing at Holmwood, Watts-Dunton had taken over the conduct of Swinburne's affairs and was energetically trying to unravel them. The task was not easy and called both for tact and patience.

On October 30, 1872, Watts-Dunton writes to Swinburne to say that he had called upon Hotten, not in a professional capacity, but as Swinburne's "friend," and that Hotten had promised to send a statement of his terms in a few days.

"Up to now" (the letter continues) "he has sent nothing. I shall go to him on Friday and, should he propose nothing satisfactory, shall I, before formally demanding the delivering up of your books, ask Mr. Ellis whether he would feel disposed to purchase Hotten's stock (at a proper valuation)? Until we can tell Hotten that we can settle whatsoever claims he may be found to have, hostile bearing would be worse than useless. Let me know, *at once*, whether I have your permission to name it to Mr. Ellis as, in that case, I shall call upon him immediately before my interview with Hotten."

A postscript adds:

"We will negotiate amicably if we can—owing to the difficulty of clearing him of his stock—but, if he means to play the blackguard, he will find me not at all the person to be so played with, and from a word or two he dropped the other week, he seems to have a wholesome dread of lawyers and litigation."

Evidently Swinburne consented to Messrs. Ellis being approached, and on November 9 Watts-Dunton reports thus:

"I have seen Mr. Ellis twice and proposed to him that, in the event of nothing satisfactory being come to with Hotten, he should take the books now in Hotten's hands. He said that, as there was, doubtless, a good deal of stock now in hand, for which the sale would be slow—poetry being, during the last year or two, almost a drug

(Hotten had told me the same thing) he did not think it would answer his, or any person's purpose to relieve Hotten of slow-selling stock which, doubtless, the latter would be only too glad to get cash for, on the terms usually allowed by valuers in such matters. 'Songs before Sunrise' he said was having a very slow sale, indeed—to his own surprise, as he considers it the finest volume of poetry that has appeared for many years.

"Briefly, he politely declined entertaining it. But he said that, if another publisher should feel inclined to take it up, and should want to take everything of yours, he would, should you desire it, let him take also, what he, Ellis, has of yours. This suggestion came from him, & not from me—though I did not say there was any idea of another publisher being applied to."

That Watts-Dunton contemplated such a move is evident from another passage in the letter :

"I, yesterday, called on Mr. King of Cornhill, in consonance with your letter, and put the Hotten case to him. He said that he should be happy to entertain it, if, on seeing a statement from Hotten, he found, from a business point of view, that it could be done. And I think, he is the man for the case. I told him to keep the proposal a secret between ourselves, at present, until we should get a balance-sheet from Hotten, when I would see him again.

"I then saw Hotten (after calling 3 times) and asked him how it was that he did not send his statement as he had promised. His excuse was pressure of business, but he promised, very solemnly, to send it next week, without fail.

"I then named the Chapman matter to him, and we had a long conversation upon it. His version of the affair is this : Three or four years ago, he decided to bring out a collection of Chapman's dramas in his series of old English Dramatists and engaged you to write an introductory critical essay & Halliwell to edit it—that he employed a person (I forget his name, but a man who wrote a volume called 'Tennysonianana')¹ to do the mechanical part—copying &c. that he paid this person a weekly stipend for his work, and that, now, he finds that the person has been using the materials which he, Hotten, had paid for, in aid of Mr. Pearson's forthcoming edition ; of which project he was apprised by a friend—that his own edition

¹ R. H. Shepherd, whose edition of Chapman was published by Chatto and Windus, 1874-75.

is now in hand and will, to a *certainty*, be out in February; and that he looks to you for the introductory essay. He told me all this, at once, before I had time to do more than ask him whether he had not abandoned the project of bringing out Chapman. You will do nothing at all with him in this matter—Spite of the ignorant vulgarity of the man, he seems fully alive to your being able to write a capital essay on Chapman. Shall I see Pearson for you, and ascertain whether you could not do *something* for him in connexion with Chapman or some other dramatist? Could you not write an essay for both publishers?"

Nearly a month passed, and still Hotten gave no reply, which delayed the negotiations with King. On December 5 Watts-Dunton writes:

"Up to now I hear nothing from Hotten and I am placed in this dilemma with regard to him. I fear that, unless I make a formal legal application I shall never get an account and on the other hand if I do make such a demand he will so swell out his accounts (being thrown into hostile relations with me) that Mr. King, who really seems anxious to get the publication of your books, might feel his courage checked. I will again see Hotten, and then, if I shld. fail in obtaining what I want had I not better send him in a formal demand? When I saw him last, he said that there was next to nothing coming to you.

"Since I saw you, I have made many enquiries about him and I was told a day or two since that he was very impecunious. If this is so, the worse for us. Have you any friend in town with whom I could discuss these matters orally? . . . I was told on Sunday that Tinsley had a great desire to publish something of yours. Indeed, there is no likelihood, as you say, of your things going begging. Mr. King, I have more than once heard, is the most liberal publisher in London and, if you have anything you could offer him, I shall be happy to see him and open negotiations."

However, Swinburne proved unwilling to have dealings with King,¹ who had acquired Strahan's stock and also taken over the *Contemporary Review*. The reason for his objection becomes clear when we recall that Strahan was Robert Buchanan's publisher and that it was in the *Contemporary* for October 1871 that Buchanan, under the pseudonym of Henry Maitland, had published his article on "The Fleshly School of Poetry." Watts-Dunton writes again on December 11, 1872, and while admitting that the attitude of Swinburne, still indignant after

¹ Cf. T. J. Wise, *A Swinburne Library*, 1925, pp. 70-72.

penning *Under the Microscope*, is comprehensible, he begs him to ponder carefully before losing the opportunity of what he obviously regards as likely to be a profitable arrangement. He says:

"I admire the tone of your letter—I have always admired your indomitable pluck as much [as] your genius—but I am not quite sure that you should discard Mr. King so uncompromisingly as you are doing. I say, I am not quite sure of this, but there is a great deal in what you say. Let us however consider it for a moment. Mr. King, who has the kindest of feelings towards you and seems to have a genuine admiration of your poems, is making a great push in business and indeed is (between ourselves, this) buying at prices that speak for his enthusiasm more than for his judgment, and among other ventures he has taken Strahan's stock. This is a purely commercial speculation (and the commercial mind, as you know, soars as high above your own chivalric code as ever the Emperor Sigismund soared above grammar)—and a necessary part of this commercial speculation was taking the *Contemporary Review* and the offal called 'Buchanan's poetry.' As to 'Buchanan's poetry,' you have no more to do with that than you have to do with Hotten's ocean of ineffable trash. And, with regard to the *Contemporary Review*, Strahan, & not Knowles (the editor) was answerable for the insertion of Buchanan's libel. Strahan always exercised a dictatorship over that review, and B. being a brother Scot who had come to London for the express purpose of pushing better men off their stools, nothing is more likely than that the 'Maitland' article never passed through Knowles's hands at all. (Or rather, I have been told, I recollect, that Knowles strongly objected to it.) Still it appeared in the '*Contemporary*,' and I can understand your refusing to become, at any time during Knowles's editorship, a contributor to it, and if Buchanan instead of Knowles were the editor I could even conceive your refusing to have any business dealings with the man who published it. But B. is *not* the editor, and neither Mr. King nor any one else will I should imagine long continue to publish the 'works' of the perpetrator of the '*Drama of Kings*.' It is impossible to conceive even a British public tolerating this Barnum of literature after that last astounding production. With regard to Buchanan himself I have always felt that clever as '*Under the Microscope*' was, you wronged yourself somewhat by throwing yourself into the attitude of antagonism towards such a very poor creature. I can fancy the delight of that

superlative cad at finding himself in actual respectable warfare with the author of 'Atalanta.' When a common bully throws down the glove before his superior it should not be picked up or noticed, save to be contemptuously trampled in the mire. Otherwise, we shall have all the bullies pitching their dirty gloves at your feet. All the Buchanans of Scotland could not injure you or Mr. Rossetti by all the coarse calumnies they might choose to print—while dunces craving for fame can only live when genius consents to write a Dunciad.

"Bear in mind, however, that I am not so much arguing against the position you have taken up with regard to King as trying to show to you, and indeed to myself that there is something, perhaps, to be said upon the other side and if, as it seems to me, you are influenced in your feelings more by your love for Rossetti than by your own personal considerations of self, I have not much to urge against your determination. But King, I suspect, when I come to read to him your letter, will naturally hit upon what I have just said above."

This letter, so skilfully designed to win Swinburne over to Watts-Dunton's point of view, was unable to overcome the poet's opposition.¹ A letter on December 13 makes it evident that all thought of King has now been abandoned and that on his own initiative Watts-Dunton has entered into discussions with Messrs. Chapman and Hall.

"Since I posted my last letter to you, I have ascertained that Mr. King has actually retained Strahan (the man mostly answerable for the Maitland libel) as his manager. So, I fear, we must give up King.

"I then went to Chapman & Hall (I am on friendly terms with Mr. Chapman) and in confidence opened the matter to him—knowing that the firm is very rich, &, if willing, quite able to outbid almost any other publishers. Chapman says he would rather publish for you than for any other poet, and the terms he offered were the most liberal I have heard of.

"He will buy out Hotten; and suggests that he should bring out a cheap edition of your entire poems, in conformity with his celebrated cheap ed. of Carlyle and other writers—the subscribers to which would, he thinks, buy your poems, thus issued, 'by thousands.' I send you a specimen copy of Carlyle. He would, if you thought well, issue a very large number of the proposed

¹ Cf. T. J. Wise, *A Swinburne Library*, pp. 65-66.

volume, with your portrait, and he will pay you most liberally. I am in a great hurry to save post, but will write to you with full details, *on hearing from you that you are open to negotiate with Chapman.*

"Lord Lytton's poems are to be issued in the same form, but C. wants yours *first*. Let me know, *by return of post*, whether you have any objection to Chapman & Hall. If you have none, there is, of course, no comparison between such a house as theirs & Tinsley's. . . . I believe that this idea of the cheap edition would solidify your present position more than anything else and so think many friends. . . . I took the liberty, unauthorised, to name it to Chapman but the time had quite come when some decisive move should be made."

In the meantime Watts-Dunton was far from overlooking the need for clearing up Swinburne's transactions with Hotten. He had alluded to the matter in his letter of December 11, and asked that one of Swinburne's friends, either Joseph Knight or Thomas Purnell, should investigate the situation with him. On receiving this letter, Swinburne wrote at once to Purnell and incidentally showed how strongly impressed he had been by Watts-Dunton's arguments about the suitability of King as a publisher.¹ Apparently Purnell was slow to communicate with Watts-Dunton, who on December 19 writes to Swinburne thus:

"Until we get the statement from Hotten it would be well to keep the negotiation with Messrs. Chapman quiet, as, should it reach Hotten's ears, it might cause still further delay. I do not hear from Mr. Purnell. I wish you would let me have all the facts within your memory of the contract with Hotten. Give me every possible thing you can call to mind and leave me to pick the wheat from the chaff. I recollect what you told me at your place; but, you had better, if you please, give it me all again, fully. Was there any thing said about the number of editions he was to print?"

"At present I am dubious (from incomplete knowledge of the facts) whether we can or cannot (without fear of an injunction) issue a cheap edition *without* buying Hotten's stock. Of course, if we could do this, he would be effectually checkmated. But I fear he can restrain us, on the ground that such a proceeding would injure his property, for which he has paid a valuable consideration."

Watts-Dunton's uneasiness grew steadily, and he was greatly concerned to know if Hotten had been promised the publication of *Bothwell* and

¹ Cf. *The Letters of Algernon Charles Swinburne*, ed. Edmund Gosse and T. J. Wise, London, 1918, vol. i, pp. 112-113.

Tristram of Lyonesse. He was desirous to bring the affair to a decision and to close with Messrs. Chapman, though he was much too astute to betray his eagerness, as this letter of December 21 proves :

" I have just seen Mr. Chapman again ; and my last interview with him has evidently somewhat fired him. I did not, of course, think it good policy to let him see an undue alacrity on your part to enter into the negotiation with his house ; so he mentioned the matter to Mr. John Morley, who promised to write to you upon the subject. You will, I am sure, pardon (though perhaps not much admire) my suggesting (as a business man) that, in purely commercial transactions of this kind, it is best to get all the desire to treat from ' the other side,' if possible.

" Chapman promises to pay over, in cash, the price of every issue, as soon as issued, and before a sale, and I do not doubt that you will, at once, come into some money—but it would not be well to let him know that you really are, just now, somewhat in need of that article—as you have frankly hinted to me. Not that Mr. Chapman is, in any way, a man likely to take a mean advantage of you on that account (for I believe him to be a gentleman, and in so far, a phenomenon among publishers) but it is wonderful how practical ' gentlemen ' are in business matters, as you may have observed, if you have ever bought a horse of a friend or sold one to him. Imperceptibly to himself, Mr. Chapman would be more anxious to deal liberally with us, if he thought we did not care a damn whether he dealt with us or not. He, himself, has lost a card or two, by exhibiting his own anxiety to treat. As a man, I like him the more for it. But as a trader, I respect him the less. . . .

" I told Hotten positively the other day that I would wait no longer for his account. So I have, this very moment, got one—such as it is. He says it is inchoate and provisional merely—but I insisted upon having *some* account, or I would have filed a bill on Monday. He said he could not get it out for to day unless he sat up till eleven o'clock ; but I told him that, if he and his assistants too sat up all night, I would not wait another hour. (I was driven to this, at last, as you will grant.) He says ' There are a few items in Mr. Swinburne's private act. and the money paid to Mr. Tindal[1] to be deducted. Directly Christmas is over, I will write to you at length with respect to Mr. Swinburne's books.'

" I send you the account. Please look through it and return it with your comments at once, as Chapman has promised to analyze

it with me, item by item. He wants to see a copy of each book of yours. Perhaps you had better furnish me with an order to Hotten and to Ellis to give me copies of all the books for that purpose. Ellis will, if need be, aid us in a settlement."

The next development is reported to Swinburne on December 31 :

"Mr. Chapman considers Hotten's account very unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it does not show what stock there is on hand. Until a detailed account is furnished nothing, of course, can be done. I wish you would therefore send me a letter something like the following that I may show it to Hotten :

'MY DEAR WATTS,

'The statement you send me from Mr. Hotten is the most unsatisfactory thing I ever saw in my life. It gives me no insight whatever as to how we stand towards each other and this is all I want. What I have been waiting for all these weeks (and what I now mean to have *at once*) is a statement showing not merely what books have been sold, but what stock is now on hand,—indeed a fair and open balance sheet such as publishers usually furnish every quarter. That he does not mean to furnish this however, seems now clear ; and he drives me at last into forcing him to do so. I am sorry that it should come to this. Please see him without delay and let him know that I will not wait an hour beyond this day week.

'Yours etc.'

Something in this way would aid me in getting what I so much want."

A fortnight passed, and then on January 13, 1873, Watts-Dunton informed Hotten that he had given instructions for legal proceedings against him.¹ This put an end to all procrastination, and the very next day Watts-Dunton is able to announce that Hotten has communicated with him :

"Hotten has sent the enclosed account, which, please, look through and return to me by tomorrow night's post, in order that I may submit it to Mr. Chapman. As soon as we have got all accounts from Hotten we must demand the balance coming to you ; but the negotiation with the new publisher is of paramount importance.

"There was an account furnished to Benham and Tindall

¹ Cf. T. J. Wise, *A Swinburne Library*, p. 28.

which we may find useful in explaining these latter statements. Who has that account?—You, or Mr. Tindall—or your referee, Mr. Howell?

“Furnish me with any criticism upon the accounts that may occur to you; as I have arranged to meet Mr. Chapman at the Garrick Club some day in this week or next—to be fixed by me—for the purpose of having a long, uninterrupted & thorough discussion of your matters.”

On January 16 Watts-Dunton has good news for Swinburne, though Hotten had revived his claim to be sole publisher of all Swinburne's works:

“I have seen Mr. Tindall and he will send you a cheque for the balance tonight. He tells me that Hotten sets up a claim to exclusive right of publishing all your books—past present and future. This seems monstrous—but oddly enough, when I was in Messrs. Chapman & Hall today Hotten had just sent in for all the numbers of the Fortnightly containing articles by you!

“Everything is going on prosperously with Chapman and notwithstanding the tremendous amount of stock to take, he keeps to his idea of issuing, as soon as we can swing [clear] of the Hotten muddle, an elegant cheap edition of about 3 or 4 vols. I am now pushing into the matter with all the force at my command.”

Preposterous though Watts-Dunton might consider Hotten's claim, he was worried about the legal position, as appears from his letter of January 29:

“Mr. Chapman has had printed a specimen page of the proposed cheap edition of your books; which I will send to you. But I really begin to fear that the trouble with Hotten (enormous as it has been) is but in its inception. By the strong wish of Mr. Chapman, I saw H. yesterday, with the view of endeavouring to get him to come to reasonable terms as to the price to be paid for the stock now on hand. I then, for the first time, told him that you thought of seeking *some* other publisher. He said that the oral contract between you was that he should always print & sell the books he now has on hand & that you cannot take them out of his hands. Of course I treated the statement with scorn; but he said that he should certainly litigate it. This may be the bluster of a vulgar charlatan who has found bluster to be a useful weapon in his multiform dealings with fellows of his own kidney—but,

undoubtedly, it may irritate & worry us ; and already, the trouble I have had with him has been without any kind of limit.

" I saw Mr. W. M. Rossetti upon it, the other day ; and he says he had, at one time, some notes of the agreement originally come to between you and H. ; but that he sent them to you—since when they have never been forthcoming. Do, pray, look them up, without delay, and send them to me. I am getting really harassed by this matter. Here is Mr. Chapman ready to issue a popular edition of your books which would extend your fame throughout England and America and place you in the position you deserve to hold—has even set up a specimen page of it—and is ready to pay you liberally ; —and we cannot move, because we have no tittle of reliable evidence (*legally* reliable, I mean, for in a court of law or of equity a man's evidence for himself is not of much account) as to your actual relations with your present publisher. Of course Hotten would have taken a copy of those minutes ; or rather, he took minutes of his own.

" Mr. Rossetti (William) can give me but little information. Could Mr. Howell assist me ? If so, will you write to him and ask him to give me an appointment at 15 Great James Street Bedford Row (where I have just taken chambers, having left Putney) ? He should give me, if he can, two days notice and he had better make it after business hours. I went to his house at Fulham some days since, but he was out, and is always out, they say, all day. The evening would suit me best.

" I told Hotten he had better send you the money which, as he states, is now owing to you—about 30*£* or a little more. If he does so, you might acknowledge it thus.

' DEAR SIR

' I have received your cheque for *£*— on account of the sum owing to me by you.'

Affix to it a receipt stamp and keep an *examined* copy (examined by another with you and marked 'examined' by him or her). If he imports other matters unconnected with the mere cheque into his letter, do not reply as to those matters, without first communicating with me.

" Chapman was in hopes that we might induce him to take a reasonable sum for his stock and that the business might be done amicably. But he (Hotten) means fight—if he *can* fight. Those minutes will show whether he can or not."

Swinburne sent W. M. Rossetti's notes to Watts-Dunton, and on January 30 begged Howell to arrange a meeting with Watts-Dunton at once. On February 6 he wrote to Howell and thanked him for his help. The letter shows that he was in a dense fog as far as his relations with Hotten went and also that he was anxious to avoid a quarrel, because he feared that Hotten might have in his possession papers of a Rabelaisian kind, tossed off by Swinburne for his friends, which, if published, would give a handle to the libellous critic.¹ When Watts-Dunton next writes to Swinburne on March 27, it is obvious that his eagerness to clinch the bargain was justified, for there are now signs of a prudential hesitation on Chapman's part :

"Enclosed I send you a specimen page of the cheap edition of the works which Mr. Chapman proposes to issue. What do you think of it? He told me on Tuesday (in strict confidence) that there were reasons in connection with H's *general* matters for keeping in abeyance, for two or three weeks, the negotiation for the purchase of stock in hand. If his idea of the present position of H. is a true one, he has, no doubt, good commercial reasons for the course he proposes to take; for anything that would work to reduce the sum necessary to purchase a stock of 5000 volumes should be seized upon. I will write to you again hereon. Meantime, let me know how you like the specimen page."

Watts-Dunton had given thought to the possibility of expanding Swinburne's income from his writings and he now broaches the question of an English publisher for *Bothwell* and the equally important problem of arranging the publication of Swinburne's work in America, both of them topics which come up for frequent discussion in subsequent letters :

"By the bye, who is to publish '*Bothwell*'? Do not sell it too cheaply to any one; for I think it is going to be your greatest work. Chapman asked me how much you would ask for it. There are some lyrics in it. Would it not be well to get them printed, at once, in some American magazine and so get the poem talked about, and, at the same time, make a little money by them? I named it to Joaquin Miller the other day and I have no doubt that you could get, say, £10 each for any lyric. *Let me know your views on this.* You ought to make a good income out of America, where you are so enormously famous. The New York '*Independent*' would take any lyrics of yours and pay liberally for them."

Although Watts-Dunton had been acting on Swinburne's behalf only

¹ Cf. *The Letters of Algernon Charles Swinburne*, ed. Gosse and Wise, vol. i, pp. 117-123.

for a few months, his zeal and ability had won for him the poet's esteem, and Watts-Dunton's next letter of March 31 is a milestone on the road towards their lasting friendship :

" MY DEAR SWINBURNE

" For I shall be but too pleased to drop the Mr.—depend upon it—do by all means send me *any* lyrics you may have by you, and I doubt not a ready market & a good one can be had for them at once in America. And if the 'Examiner' would consent to it (and, why not?) I should say that you might get *twice* paid for those sonnets, by issuing them simultaneously in London & New York. Perhaps this is worth considering and when you come to offer 'Bothwell' to a publisher something ought to be said, (after a sum has been agreed upon) about a reserved right to you (in case you *sell* the book) of simultaneously issuing it at Boston or New York. I believe a good sum might thus be realized. Novelists who have the American ear (especially Chas. Reade) do splendidly by a clever management of the American market. You have an enormous audience in America."

The letter concludes by saying :

" The iteration of vowel-rhymes in those new sonnets is tremendously effective but my own ear can scarcely stand them."

The sonnets in question were those entitled *Diræ*, among which was the group on "The Saviour of Society." As Watts-Dunton's letter of April 4 proves, he felt that their violent attack on Napoleon III would be likely to attract the American public. He was therefore all the more anxious that there should be no hitch in the arrangements for publication :

" We must be careful to exclude from those sent any that may appear in the 'Examiner' before they reach America. This, I must leave to you. What the Editor wanted was 'lyrics' but I dare say sonnets will also be acceptable and I do not *anticipate* that there will be any objection on the ground of their simultaneous appearance in the 'Examiner,' so that the Americans get them decidedly *first*.

" I think you had better send me a letter something like the following and I will send it to America :

' Thanks for your letter and its suggestions about "Bothwell" which I shall certainly attend to. You again ask me for some lyrics for the "New York Independent." I have some by me which

I think might be suitable and I will see to them as soon as I can find the time to do so. But those sonnets I sent to you the other day seem to me unusually well adapted for publication in America in which I think you will agree with me. They will appear as you are aware in the "Examiner" at the rate of two a week but the American journal could arrange with you for their being printed there before their appearance here and I have the consent of the Editor of the "Examiner" to such an arrangement with any American journal. I do not know the "New York Independent" myself but, as you recommend it, I take it to be a high-class paper and one suitable for me to write for. May I send you all the M.S.S. and leave you to arrange everything for me, as you have so often done? Should it happen that the "New York Independent" does not care for *sonnets* I am told that most of the American journals would take them, but I never either directly or indirectly offer anything to a magazine or newspaper, as you know.'

I would have sent your last letter to me, on to America, but I think the above (or rather something in the tone of the above) will be more suitable. You had better perhaps, also say that you wish to leave everything entirely to me. It is a most troublesome thing the arrangement for the simultaneous publication of weekly contributions to London & New York journals even after both journals have agreed to it."

This letter is admirably calculated for its purpose, suggesting as it does the insignificance of a mere journal to so great and remote a personage as the poet Swinburne. Moreover, here as elsewhere, Watts-Dunton displays penetrating insight into human nature. Knowing Swinburne's weakness in business matters, he skilfully emphasises the tiresomeness of conducting these negotiations, and without seeming too obviously to manage his friend, shepherds him along the desired path and induces him to leave all arrangements to his legal representative. The wisdom of the plan in Swinburne's interests is confirmed by Watts-Dunton's letter of April 7:

"I fear there is no likelihood of your being able to let me know the order of succession in which the sonnets will appear in the 'Examiner.' Yet, without this knowledge, I fear that confusion may arise. There is another mail out on Thursday and again another on Saturday; so, I think I could keep them in hand till I hear from you on this point; when, too, you will be able to send the

letter I suggested or something like it. I want the editor to see no great alacrity on your part—that is why I drew out the letter.

"With regard to the lyrics I imagine that you would have but small difficulty in issuing them simultaneously in America and in England."

A postscript explains Watts-Dunton's remark in his letter of March 31 about the vowel-rhymes in the new sonnets:

"What I meant by the iteration of vowel-rhymes occurs in the first two sonnets—almost all the rhyming words of which have the same vowel-sounds. When you have time to satisfy my curiosity I am very desirous to know whether there is any artistic reason for such a singular effect, a reason that may have eluded me."

For some weeks the problem of Hotten had been left untouched, but it was not solved, and a new complication was introduced when Hotten announced *Bothwell* in his list. In his letter of April 7, Watts-Dunton encloses the following draft to be sent by Swinburne to the publisher:

"D. SIR,

"A friend of mine has just pointed out to me that you have advertised in your list a new poem called 'Bothwell' by me. For this procedure you have no manner of authority and I think it well to tell you, once for all, that even if I had this or any other poem ready for publication I should use my own discretion as to the publisher to whom I should offer it. I must request that you will immediately remove it from your lists. It only creates a prejudice against you among my friends this endeavour to throw a net around me."¹

Thereupon Swinburne had to confess that Hotten's action was not entirely unjustified. How greatly this embarrassed Watts-Dunton may be seen from his letter of April 9:

"I am exceedingly sorry to find from your letter to Hotten that 'Bothwell' was originally advertised in his list with your sanction. This amounts to something very like a contract between him & you and he is not the man to forego one tittle of his rights. But even if there was such a permission your proposed letter to him will not do. It is a palpable admission of what he would otherwise have to prove by troublesome means. In legal matters, written admissions are always to be carefully avoided.

¹ Cf. T. J. Wise, *A Swinburne Library*, pp. 75-76, for Swinburne's reply to Watts-Dunton on April 8.

"The letter of which I sent you a draft still seems to me to be a proper one to send—omitting, perhaps, the last paragraph about his enmeshing you in a net. It can do no harm, and is a piece of documentary evidence—(take an *examined* copy of it)—and may get him to declare himself. But I am disconcerted by what I hear about 'Bothwell' this morning."

This experience strengthened Watts-Dunton's desire to see that no error was made in arranging for the American publication of Swinburne's poems, and his letter of April 10 stresses the necessity of dispelling all ambiguity in this transaction :

"The negotiation we are entering upon with regard to the sonnets requires careful handling : Did you tell the editor of the 'Examiner' that you proposed issuing them simultaneously in America or that they would appear there a week or so in advance of their appearance in London ? And have you received an answer from him ? This should be clearly understood, even if there should be a week's delay. I should imagine that the Editor of the 'Examiner' would not trouble himself about the matter but I do not know. Very likely you may not care to trouble him too much about the proposal ; but I hope you gave him clearly to understand what you want.

"It may occur that the editor of the American newspaper would not care to pay much for sonnets unless he could issue them some little time before they could be copied by American newspapers from the 'Examiner.' Anyhow, this had better be fully & clearly understood. . . . All I want is, to know exactly what has been written to the 'Examiner.'"

The usefulness of Watts-Dunton's watchful insistence on these details is demonstrated by a brief note on April 12 :

"In order to guard against future misunderstandings I think it *would* be well for you to tell the editor of the 'Examiner' that the 'New York Independent' will print the sonnets a week before their appearance or perhaps a fortnight."

Swinburne had displayed a not unnatural reluctance to send his letter to Hotten on the subject of *Bothwell*. On April 30 Watts-Dunton urges him to take action and informs him that the poems are despatched to America :

"I return you the letter, which I think you should send off from Holmwood now, without delay. We should know now, what he really means.

"The sonnets & the lyrics I sent off to America by last Saturday's post. With regard to the latter, I am somewhat dubious whether the editor will greatly care to take a poem which, *so soon*, is to appear here. It was awaiting the 'Examiner's' reply which delayed the sending off of the batch for a week."

The rest of the letter, which is mainly concerned with a paper by Watts-Dunton on *Hamlet*, is of interest as showing that the conversations between Swinburne and his adviser already extended far beyond mere legal business :

"Your criticism on the 'Hamlet' I shall prize very much. My article—the only value of which is that it has elicited such remarks from you—was the hurried production of a single evening, and was written to dictation. It can scarcely be said to embody my actual opinion of Shakespeare's dramatic art ; or rather, it only represents *one* side of my opinion, which is, merely, that, whether or not he was, by original endowment of Nature, the ideal dramatist which he is generally considered to be, he is not, *actually*, that ideal dramatist ; partly because his thoughts and feelings were too apt to crystal[l]ize into literary axioms and manneristic gnomes, and partly because he lived in [an] age when *no* one could be, in any way, a perfect dramatist, for the reason that *Fancy* (the sworn enemy of *Imagination*, and not her servant, as she is wrongly considered) was set high above *Imagination* ; and when the *pretty* way of saying a thing was esteemed more precious than the *truthful* way of saying a thing. With all your generous admiration of Shakespeare, I believe that the 'fork' between us is not so wide as, at first, it seems. However, your own dramatic instincts (as evidenced in your every lyric, quite as much as in your dramas) are so true that I half expect that I may, one day, come to your (and the general) opinion upon Shakespeare. Yet, at present, it does surprise me that a dramatist who, in his scenes of passion *never* lets *Fancy* break into the severe truth of high *Imagination* should see no fault in Shakespeare when he does so. . . ."

Swinburne communicated with Hotten on May 1, and on May 4 the cautious Watts-Dunton again returns to the matter :

"I forgot to say in my last letter to you that you should keep a copy of the letter sent to Hotten and get it examined. I told you this on a former occasion, but I fear you may have forgotten it. Should this be the case, you should make a copy of the *draught*

letter and get *that* examined and *keep both* that and the copy and mark upon them *both* the day of the month when they were posted."

Watts-Dunton now launched another scheme for establishing Swinburne's fame and replenishing his purse. This was the publication of a collection of his critical essays. At the close of his letter on April 30, he says that he will see Chapman in a few days and discover what terms can be obtained. On May 8 he informs Swinburne of the result of the interview:

"I saw Mr. Chapman yesterday, and he will take the essays at once. Will you kindly let me know what they are and what will be about the number of pages (say of the size of the 'Fortnightly Review' pages) and what you think Chapman ought to give you for a single issue of them? Have they all appeared in the 'Fortnightly'? If we can get a definite statement on this head C. will send you a cheque as soon as we can come to terms. I suppose Mr. Morley would offer no objection."

Then he goes on to speak of the publication of Swinburne's poems in America:

"Mr. Chapman told me that he offered (through Lippincott) the proof sheets of that last poem of yours in the 'Fortnightly'¹ to several American houses and could not get them off. This news is rather discouraging to us who have a batch of sonnets on their way to New York. I hope there is not a prejudice there against *simultaneous* issues. But let us wait and hope."

Evidently Swinburne hesitated about the new plan, fearing that the appearance of the essays might give the signal for an onslaught upon him and so, on May 17, Watts-Dunton writes:

"I gathered from your letter that you had decided not to collect and publish the essays for a time, for the reasons which you put to me: Therefore I did not discuss the matter. I am not at all sure that they *would* produce the effect you anticipate, and merely keeping an author's name before the public is—in these thickly crowded times—an advantage. Still, you have undoubtedly enemies—born of envy, mostly—who would attack anything of yours. But even attacks are in one sense, advantageous and the writing in the essays is, with the exception of Carlyle's, the most entirely original, both in matter & in manner, of our day. What is there in the articles which you think open to attack?"

¹ Probably *North and South*, which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review*, May 1, 1873, pp. 564-66.

A month passed and no decision had been arrived at about the essays, when an event of the utmost importance occurred. Watts-Dunton writes with all speed on June 19 :

"Hotten is dead. Is there anything in connexion with the affairs between you and him which I do not know and which it may be important for me, now, to know ? Has he any property of yours which should be demanded of the executors ? You once mentioned some old plays."

Then, reverting to the essays, he says :

"With regard to the 'Studies' I think it would be well to omit all the articles upon contemporary *poets*. What do you think yourself ?" ¹

The haste with which this letter was written had prevented Watts-Dunton from explaining as fully and as persuasively as was his wont the reasons for the course suggested. Swinburne was therefore greatly displeased, and in his next letter, dated June 23, Watts-Dunton defers to his wishes, while discreetly urging him not to reprint *Under the Microscope* or his criticisms of Tennyson :

"I fear that you have taken amiss my suggestion that the articles on the English poets might be omitted in the proposed collection of your essays. And yet, I made it entirely in consideration of what seemed to me your interest, to the exclusion of that of the interest of one at least of the poets criticised who is dear to me.

"My view of the matter was that, valuable as are, undoubtedly, the articles in question, your generous enthusiasm has often led you into expressions of admiration which your cooler judgment might now induce you to withdraw, but which it might, nevertheless be somewhat difficult to do, without a withdrawal of the entire article. If, however, I have been mistaken in this, I have no more to say upon it, and (as you say) you certainly did not ask my advice upon it.

"It being decided, then, that the articles upon contemporary English poets are to be included, I quite think with you that some of them contain your very best writing, unless indeed they are surpassed by *portions* of 'Under the Microscope' and by the preface to Moxons selections from Byron. Whether, however, it would be admirable to reprint the whole of that remarkable pamphlet, is, perhaps, somewhat open to discussion ; but you, of course, must

¹ Cf. T. J. Wise, *A Swinburne Library*, p. 67.

be the best judge. Should you do this, I am half inclined to think that it *would* be better to postpone its issue till after the appearance of 'Bothwell.' My own opinion about your entering the lists with men like Buchanan & Co. I have already given you, for what it is worth. But a more serious question, perhaps, presents itself in connection with the strictures upon Tennyson. That they are just and as acute as just, I quite think. But, as yours is a name, one would think, certain to go down for many a generation, it becomes important to be even squeamish in considering whether it should be coupled with any kind of strictures, however just, upon contemporary brother poets. Moreover, Tennyson, I was told, only yesterday, is greatly hurt at what he considers an *attack* upon him; and has expressed his wonder as to what can have moved you to it.

"These are all the points I have to put before you, and, I doubt not, that you will at least take them in a frank spirit—whether you see anything in them or not. Doubtless, you are right in considering the remarks upon Rossetti, in your 'Notes on the Royal Academy of 1868' to be worthy of preservation. Indeed, Rossetti himself thinks *all* your art-criticisms very valuable—the finest of our times."

Then follow a survey of the position with regard to Hotten and a suggestion that if Chapman would not give satisfactory terms for *Bothwell* it should be published by Chatto, Hotten's manager and prospective successor in the business:

"I called at Hotten's. His manager, Mr. Chatto, has some hope of taking the business. He says you know him & have a good opinion of him. Is that so?"

"I saw Purnell yesterday and he seemed to think that there were two novels, in manuscript, of yours, lying at Hotten's place. What can this mean?"

"The present position of affairs is this. When I first told Hotten that Messrs. Chapman & Hall were going to take your books out of his hands, he said that this could not be done, and that he would 'spend his last shilling' in litigating the matter. Upon making thorough enquiry, however, of you & Mr. Tindle (sic!) and Mr. Howell & Mr. Rossetti, I found that H. had no contract, even oral, which could be made the basis of a bill of injunction. Having, at last, *thoroughly* satisfied myself of this, I went to him and told him of our determination to take the matters out of his hands; but I told him that we were willing to buy his stock, at a fair &

reasonable valuation. He still refused to listen to reason, when I gave him notice that we should in that case, immediately issue a cheap edition of your entire works, ignoring him & leaving him to get out of his heavy stock as he best could; upon this, he came to, and the only open question then was as to what we were to pay for the stock which his account showed amounted to 5000 volumes! Chapman naturally wanted to buy such a heavy stock (the sale of which would be immediately slackened by his projected cheap edition) as cheaply as possible, while Hotten's last chance of getting anything out of you was to demand the uttermost farthing for the stock. Just as I was about seeing a man skilled in this kind of business to act as arbitrator, Chapman told me it had better remain in abeyance for a little time, owing to certain information that had reached him in connexion with Hotten. Thus, the matter stood when Hotten died. The question now, of course, will be, what we shall give the administratrix (he died without a will) for the stock.

"Chatto is naturally anxious (should he take the business) to publish something for you, and perhaps, if Mr. Chapman will not give us enough for Bothwell (which however is not likely) we might treat with Chatto, if you think well of him."

One of the reasons why Watts-Dunton was especially eager to avoid anything controversial in Swinburne's collection of essays was undoubtedly the fact that just at this moment the poet was engaged in a dispute over the sonnets on *The Saviour of Society*. About these sonnets, with which the rest of Watts-Dunton's letter is concerned, a few explanatory observations may be made at this point. In the preface to a pamphlet which Mr. T. J. Wise issued privately in 1909, Sir Edmund Gosse says that they were composed in December 1869, but he does not give any reason why Swinburne should have kept them in manuscript so long. A letter addressed by Rossetti to Swinburne makes it highly probable that it was he who persuaded Swinburne to refrain from publication. Writing on May 12, 1870, Rossetti mentions that he has seen the proof-sheet of the sonnets on *The Saviour of Society*, from which we may conclude that Swinburne had intended them to form part of *Songs before Sunrise*. Even at the risk of arousing Swinburne's anger, Rossetti remonstrates with him:

"I cannot but think absolutely that a poet like yourself belongs of right to a larger circle of readers than this treatment of universal feelings can include. You know how free I am myself from any dogmatic belief; but I can most sincerely say that (except as a joke admitted and necessarily restricted to such hearers as will know it to be a joke only) I do myself feel that the supreme nobility of

Christ's character should exempt it from being used—not as a symbolic parallel to other noble things and persons in relation with which dogmatists might object to its use—but certainly in contact of this kind with anything so utterly ignoble as this. I should feel myself to breathe more freely in the splendid atmosphere of your genius if this little cloud were cleared away from it; and feeling so, a friend should say so. You have no right to imperil your sacred relation to the minds of many men worthy to profit by your mind, by using one form of metaphor rather than another when its use involves such disproportionately grave issues."

Rossetti then suggests that Swinburne should print the sonnets privately for distribution among his friends. Thus all probability of misconception will be removed:

"and you will not involve yourself (or, I may add, your publisher, to whom I think you owe some consideration) in an obloquy which I do not myself think (after most serious reflection on a point so serious) that just poetic canons can altogether repel. Do, do, my dear Swinburne, withdraw these Sonnets. . . . This is my birthday, by the bye. Do make me the birthday gift I ask of you."¹

It was evidently the death of Napoleon III in January 1873 which determined Swinburne to print these satirical sonnets. They appeared in *The Examiner* on May 17. The same number contained various tributes to John Stuart Mill, who had died on May 8, and on May 24 *The Spectator* made the following comment:

"Surely it was hardly fair either to Mr. Mill or his friends to place their eager and sometimes tender tributes to his memory in immediate proximity to Mr. Swinburne's revolting lines headed *Diræ*, which, whatever else they mean or do not mean, certainly do mean a deadly and indecent insult to the faith of the vast majority of Christians. The mourners round a great man's grave, even though he was a great sceptic, should hardly be jostled by so profane and vulgar a companion as Mr. Swinburne permits himself to be, in this horrible attempt to outrage the most tender and sensitive of religious associations."

The following day Swinburne wrote to *The Spectator*, complaining that he had been misinterpreted with wilful malignity. He had viewed with abhorrence the blasphemous title, "The Saviour of Society," which had been conferred on Napoleon and he sought:

¹ Cf. T. J. Wise, *Catalogue of the Ashley Library*, vol. vii, p. 6

"to confute the imbecile dishonesty—for by no utmost stretch of charity can I assume it to be honest imbecility—which would bring against me the calumnious charge of a similar insult or blasphemy."

The letter ends thus :

"There are two classes of men to whom I imagine that my expressions may reasonably give offence, as uncalled for or improper ; those to whom the name of Christ and all memories connected with it are hateful, and those to whom the name of Bonaparte and all memories connected with it are not. I belong to neither class."

Swinburne's friends were delighted with this vigorous reply, as may be seen from Watts-Dunton's letter on June 23 :

"The Americans, I see, have published the sonnets on 'The Saviour of Society' ; but, up to now, I hear nothing from them. I suppose they are waiting to see how these first sonnets take, before writing as to the others. Rossetti is just sending them two poems. I took the 'Spectator' containing your capital letter, to Kelmscott with me. R. was delighted with 'honest imbecility' and 'imbecile dishonesty.'"

Ultimately Swinburne received a complimentary letter from America on the subject of the sonnets, and Watts-Dunton, desirous that there should be no neglect of the relations thus established, suggests on December 3 the terms of a reply to be written by Swinburne and, with a true understanding of the poet's ways, forwarded by Watts-Dunton :

"I fully agree with you as to the importance of you acknowledging the receipt of the money from America and the very handsome letter which accompanied it. I shall be writing to the people, in a day or two and you might, to save yourself bother, send your letter, for enclosure in mine. I think I should merely say to them that you had received their drafts in due course but that you had been out of health and away from London very much & unable to acknowledge them earlier. And then, I should say that the kind expressions in their letter would have caused you great gratification as coming from *any* one, but that they were especially grateful to you as coming from the editor of an American journal for whose opinions upon the great humanitarian questions of the age you had such an unqualified respect. The 'New York Independent' really deserves, I think, what I have said above. Then, if you send the letter to me, I will enclose it."¹

¹ The poems appeared in *The Independent* on May 22, June 12, June 26, and July 10, 1873. Cf. C. K. Hyder, *Swinburne's Literary Career and Fame*, Duke University Press, Durham, N.C., 1933, p. 299, note 26.

Watts-Dunton now directed his attention to the problem of securing a publisher for *Bothwell*, which, on December 3, he urged Swinburne to press forward with as the great work of his life up till that time, and the negotiations were prolonged into 1874. Apparently Chatto had put forward a claim to be regarded as Swinburne's publisher in view of his position as Hotten's successor. On January 7 Watts-Dunton therefore rebuked him and warned him of the consequences, if he persisted in his attitude :

" SIR,

" You say that you wish to see me. But before this can be, I must know positively whether I have not misconstrued your letter and therefore misunderstood the character of the man with whom I am corresponding. I must know whether you really mean to deny that all the correspondence oral as well as written which has passed between us has been based upon the understanding that *Mr. Swinburne and I* did not consider you as his publisher whatever might have been your own imaginings as to your position as Mr. Hotten's successor. For if you have the short sighted effrontery to do this (which however I will not yet believe) you are not a person with whom it is possible for me either as a gentleman or as a man of business to have any further intercourse except in writing. For your own sake I shall be glad to get a satisfactory letter from you."

Watts-Dunton's own preference was for Chapman and Hall, but he discovered that Chapman was not so lacking in business acumen as he had at one time thought, for while disposed to publish *Bothwell*, he proved unwilling to take over Hotten's old stock. Consequently, we find Watts-Dunton writing to Chapman on April 18 as follows :

" After leaving you on Thursday, I called upon Mr. Swinburne and found him irritated & suffering from the delay. He asked me whether I had not yet closed with you, and on my telling him that you declined to buy the old stock upon the only terms on which Messrs. Chatto & Windus would consent to sell it (and however disadvantageous to you [they] are based it would seem, upon the general custom of the trade) he would not hear of the matter's remaining any longer in abeyance but wished me to close with Messrs. Chatto & Co. whose offer was even more liberal than your own. This I did and Messrs. Chatto & Windus will now publish '*Bothwell*.' It was impossible to keep the matter another hour."

There is reason to think that Chatto did not find the transaction very profitable, as may be gathered from Watts-Dunton's letter to Swinburne on August 3, 1874 :

"I send you enclosed a letter received from Mr. Chatto. His argument seems to be, mainly, that the sum he paid for 'Bothwell' (first ed:) was equal to the royalty he had previously been paying for your books. There is one thing I do quite believe: the sums he had expended in advertising must have been so heavy as to have absorbed much of his profit on the first issue. He has, however, stated his case so fully that you will be quite as able to understand it as I, and to form an opinion upon it."

On July 21 Swinburne had been present at the Mansion House, where the Lord Mayor and the Lady Mayoress entertained the representatives of literature, art and music at a banquet, and Lord Houghton, for whom Swinburne at this stage of his career had little admiration, responded to the toast "English and Foreign Literature and Art." He said that he was a college friend of Alfred Tennyson and he hailed the rising genius of Algernon Swinburne. Commenting on this, Watts-Dunton remarks:

"You were, no doubt, much amused by Lord Houghton's mention of you at the Lord Mayor's dinner: a notable 'sign of the times.'"

The letter closes with an account of a joke about Swinburne which was being circulated by Knowles:

"I met Sandys the other day at dinner, and he told me the queerest story about a hoax of Knowles (Tennyson's henchman), the point of which was that you & Jowett were engaged on a translation of the Bible! The fun, however, was that Sandys took Knowles' small joke seriously, and insisted that Knowles believed you were so engaged."

In a very different connection Knowles is again heard of in a letter dated August 5, 1896. Swinburne's mother, now settled at Barking Hall, received on the morning of July 19, her eighty-seventh birthday, an ode of homage from her son. With regard to this Watts-Dunton writes:

"Your verses are surpassingly lovely—worthy indeed of the occasion,—and, knowing as you do my reverence and my affection for your mother, you know that I can give them no higher praise than to say this. I have myself often thought of late what a beautiful life hers has been from her leaving Barking Hall to her return. Altogether, as I have often told you, my intercourse with her and your sisters has been for me one of the sweetest parts—I think the very sweetest—of Life's education. I have sent the verses to Knowles, but I fancy he is away and that I may not hear from him

for a day or two. Although the *Nineteenth Century* does not 'lay itself out' for being an organ for the publication of poetry, Knowles will, I feel sure, be gratified to get them, and will print them at once unless the pressure of political or social subjects should baffle him."

A subsequent note, enclosing a letter from Knowles, points out the need of an explanatory title to the poem, Watts-Dunton observing :

"How many of your other poems have been neglected by readers from the same cause !"

Evidently Swinburne felt some irritation on receiving this note, which accounts for the apologetic manner of Watts-Dunton's reply :

"In my desire to catch the post on Thursday I seem to have expressed myself too hurriedly. I merely meant to say that I agreed with Knowles in his general remarks that your poems are apt to suffer from the vagueness of their titles, not that any of the titles for the present poem ought to be adopted by you : indeed I had not time to consider them even if I had thought it well to remark upon them. But my own view was that an editorial note with his own editorial initials might with your permission state the fact that the lines were 'addressed to the poet's mother' ; and this I told him. I am glad, therefore, to find that your own view of the subject is the same. I should not have presumed, however, to suggest this, or any other course, to you in regard to a subject so delicate & so sacred. There is no doubt that such a note would, *upon common literary grounds*, be a gain."

On August 12 Watts-Dunton sends the proof to Swinburne for correction and adds this striking tribute to Lady Tennyson :

"Poor Lady Tennyson, as you see, is dead. I went to see her a few days before her death. She seemed as bright as ever and had lost none of that singular spiritual beauty for which her face was so remarkable. A beloved and noble-minded woman if ever there was one !"

The tone of the next letter, dated August 24, is also subdued and mournful, though with a note of more intimate concern, for it relates to the serious illness of William Morris :

"I saw our dear Morris yesterday. He went to Norway hoping to benefit by the voyage. He has returned no whit the better for

the trip. It is very distressing. I fear that the doctors have not even yet 'diagnosed' the case. He gets very thin & weak and the organic disturbances which are the cause do not seem grave enough to account for all this effect upon him. I have arranged to go & see him more frequently as he says I can cheer him up & this does him good, for the old fellow is very depressed."

As a result of these visits it became clear to Watts-Dunton that the end was drawing near, and in an undated letter he warns Swinburne:

"I saw Morris again on Sunday. I fear the worst."

Swinburne had been keenly interested in the publication of the ode in the *Nineteenth Century*, as were all his family, and Watts-Dunton sent him a copy of the review as soon as it appeared in September. Knowles, for his part, was pleased to have this contribution and even pressed for more, as is shown by the undated letter, of which mention has just been made:

"Yesterday I got a long telegram from Knowles urging *me* to urge *you* to write a sonnet 'flaying alive the Sultan.' I told him I would convey his message to you. But I scarcely suppose you will feel inspired to touch the noisome matter. . . . Should you, however, feel inspired to attack the Turk the subject is a lively one. Certainly his recent atrocities seem genuine ones. Send me a word hereon and I will write to Knowles."¹

Thus ends this group of letters; they are valuable for the light that they throw on the relations between Swinburne and Watts-Dunton and the characters of these two men, as well as for the glimpses which they give of publishing in the nineteenth century.²

¹ In a letter dated September 11, 1896, Swinburne refused to enter for "the anti-Turkish cursing-and-swearing stakes." (Cf. T. J. Wise, *A Swinburne Library*, p. 161.)

² I wish to acknowledge my great indebtedness to Mrs. Watts-Dunton for permission to print these letters. I also desire to thank Mr. T. J. Wise for his kindness in allowing me to transcribe them, and to Mr. J. Alex. Symington, librarian of the late Lord Brotherton's library, for enabling me to collate my transcripts.

FORGOTTEN VERSES BY BEN JONSON, GEORGE WITHER, AND OTHERS TO ALICE SUTCLIFFE¹

By RUTH HUGHEY

In the British Museum there is in unique copy a small volume of meditations containing commendatory verses by Ben Jonson and George Wither which do not appear in any of the editions of their works. The book bears the following title-page :

Meditations OF MAN'S MORTALITIE. OR, A WAY TO TRVE Blessednesse. WRITTEN, By MRS. ALICE SVTCLIFFE wife of *Iohn Sutcliffe* Esquire, Groome of his Maiesties most Honourable Privie Chamber. The Second Edition, enlarged. . . . London. Printed by *B. A.* and *T. F.* for *Henry Seyle* at the *Tygers* head in *St. Pauls Church-yard*. 1634².

On the flyleaf in a hand which might be contemporary is written, "Sutcliffe, Alice of Rodd."³

The verses of these two poets and others by Thomas May,⁴ Peter Heywood,⁵ and Francis Lanton⁶ may well have formed some

¹ This study was made during my tenure of the Margaret E. Maltby Fellowship of the American Association of University Women, 1932-33.

² Catalogue No. 4412. aa. 54. (12vo.). Since this article was in type, the Huntington Library *Bulletin*, No. 4 (October, 1933), has appeared, recording the acquisition of a copy of this book. Before the *Bulletin* was accessible in England, Mr. Wm. A. Jackson had informed me of this fact, and also that the Huntington copy is the same as that listed in *The Britwell Handlist*, II, 935 (1933).

³ The Rodd must refer to Mayroid, Yorkshire, where the Sutcliffe family lived. In the pedigree of 1624, after the marriage of John and Alice, they are described as being of "Melroy" or "Meleroid." *Harl. MSS.* 1052, ff. 147-48; 1422, f. 55. For the explanation of Mayroid for "Melroy" or "Meleroid," see *Familiæ Minorum Gentium*, p. 543, *Harl. Soc.*, vols. xxxvii-xxxviii. There is no record of their having been at Rodd in Herefordshire, or at Rod Bridge on the Border of Essex and Suffolk, or at Rode (Rodden) in Somerset. For further account of the family, see below.

⁴ Thomas May is chiefly known as translator of the *Pharsalia* of Lucan, 1627, to which a tribute by Ben Jonson is prefixed.

⁵ From Peter Heywood's first line it may be assumed that he did not consider himself a poet: "I Have no Muse my owne." It is very likely that he was the Peter Heywood who was Justice of the Peace for Westminster. See *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, Charles I, 1629-1631, pp. 302, 355, 485, 498; 1631-1633, p. 435; 1633-1634, p. 190; and in later volumes.

⁶ The identity of "Fra: Lanton" is uncertain. A Francis Langston was

of the "enlarged" part of the second edition. The heading of Wither's verses, quoted below, indicates that he was writing after he had seen the meditations in book form. Since no copy of the first edition is now known, it is impossible to state definitely that a printed book is meant. The entry in the *Stationers' Registers* is made to "Master Seile" on January 30, 1632/33,¹ and it is therefore probable that the first edition was in 1633. If it is assumed that the commendations were in the second edition only, their composition would then belong to the year 1633. That Alice Sutcliffe's own book was written, in part, at least, after 1628 is evident from lines in her acrostic to Katherine, Duchess of Buckingham, where she laments the death of Buckingham.²

Jonson's verses are an addition to his Celia poems :

TO Mrs. Alice Sutcliffe, on her
divine Meditations.

*When I had read your holy Meditatio[n]s,
And in them view'd th' uncertainty of Life,
The motives, and true Spurres to all good Nations.
The Peace of Conscience, and the Godly's strife,
The Danger of delaying to Repent,
And the deceit of pleasures, by Consent.
The comfort of weake Christia[n]s, with their warning,
From fearefull back-slides ; And the debt we're in,
To follow Goodnesse, by our owne discerning
Our great reward, th' eternall Crown to win.
I sayd, who had supp'd so deepe of this sweet Chalice,
Must CELIA bee, the Anagram of ALICE.
Ben. Jonson.³*

Wither's lines are written not to Alice Sutcliffe herself but to

scholar of Trinity College, Oxford, in 1569; B.A., 1573; Fellow, 1577; M.A., 1578; B.C.L., 1578. Another Francis Langston from Sedgburie, Worcester, entered Wadham College, Oxford, in 1623, aged seventeen. Jos. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses, 1500-1714*, iii, 879; also A. Clark, *Register of the University of Oxford*, II, iii, 28.

¹ Arber, *Transcript*, iv, 265.

² Borne of High blood, from RUTLANDS Family :
Vnited to a Duke of Royall state.

Curs'd bee the time, more curs'd his cruelty
Kill'd him ; and reav'd this Turtle of her mate,
In peerlesse woe, we still lament that fate :
Nor shall his memorie e're out of date.
Goe on then Gracious Princesse, grac't by Fame,
Honour shall still, attend your noble Name :
And as your Goodnesse hath abounded, so
May Heaven the greatest good on You bestow. Sig. a

³ Sig. a4(v)-a5(r). On the latter is the misprint *Is*.

her husband, who seems to have shown pride in his wife's accomplishments by sending out copies of her book :

To Mr. IOHN SVTCLIFFE Esq. upon the receipt
of this Booke written by his Wife.

Sir, I receiv'd your Booke with acception,
And, thus returne a due congratulation,
For that good Fortune, which hath blest your life
By making you the *Spouse* of such a *Wife*.
Although I neuer saw her, yet I see,
The *Fruit*, and by the *Fruit* I judge the *Tree*.
My Praise addes nothing to it : That which is
Well done, can praise itselfe ; and so may this.
To be a woman, 'tis enough with me,
To merit praise ; For I can never be
So much their *Friend*, as they have heretofore
Deserv'd ; although they merited no more.
When, therefore to their *Woman-hood* I finde
The love of sacred *Piety* conioyn'd,
Me thinks I have my duty much forgot,
Vnlesse I praise (although I know them not)
But, when to *Woman-hood* and good *Affections*,
Those rare *Abilities*, and those *Perfections*,
Vnited are, to which our *Sexe* aspire,
Then, forc'd I am to *Love*, and to *admire*.
I am not of their mind, who if they see,
Some *Female-Studies* fairely ripened be,
(With Masculine successes) doe peevisly,
Their worths due honour unto them deny,
By overstrictly censuring the same ;
Or doubting whether from themselves it came,
For, well I know, Dame *Pallas* and the *Muses*,
Into that *Sexe*, their faculties infuses,
As freely as to *Men* ; and they that know,
How to improve their *Guise*, shall find it so.
Then ioy in your good Lot, and praises due
To *Him* ascribe, that thus hath honor'd you.

GEO. WITHER.¹

The other three contributors follow the vein of Wither in emphasizing the sex of the author of the *Meditations* ; Jonson alone has no concern on that point. May and Heywood, in contrast to Wither's insistence upon the intellectual equality of men and women, stress the rarity of the serious qualities found in Mistress Sutcliffe as opposed to those of her sex in general. Lanton describes her as "Rara Avis in our Nation," but pays tribute to all pious ladies.

¹ Sig. a6 (v)-a7 (r and v). It may be recalled that Wither had in 1632 published a volume of religious poetry, *The Psalmes of David Translated into Lyrick Verse*. In 1621 he had published *The Songs of the Old Testament*. It would, therefore, not be strange for him to receive a book of meditations for appraisal.

There follow some of these verses ;

*Would'st thou (fraile Reader) thy true Nature see?
Behold this Glasse of thy Mortality.
Digest the precepts of this pious Booke,
Thou canst not in a nobler Mirrour looke.
Though sad it seeme, and may loose mirth destroy,
That is not sad which leads to perfect ioy.
Thanke her faire Soule whose meditation makes
Thee see thy frailtie ; nor disdain to take
That knowledge, which a Womans skill can bring.
All are not Syren-notes that women sing.
How true that Sexe can write, how grave, how well,
Let all the Muses, and the Graces tell.*

THO: MA[v].¹

*Almes and Devotion, Zeale and Charity,
Might for thy Sexe be seeming Scripture be,
But when thou speak'st of death, and that iust doome
Which shall on all conditions, ages, come,
And thence descending to Philosophie,
Teachest weake Nature how to learne to dye :
It seemes to me above thy Sex and State,
Some heavenly sparke doth thee illuminate.
Live still a praise, but no example to
Others, to hope, as thou hast done, to doe.
Live still thy sexes honour, and when Death
(With whom thou art acquainted) stoppes thy breath
Fame to Posteritie shall make thee shine
And adde thy Name vnto the Muses nine.*

PET: HEYWOOD.²

*Great Ladies that to vertue are inclin'd,
See here the pious practice of a wife,
Expressed by the beauties of the Mind,
And now set forth in Pictures of the life,
Wherein matter and forme are both at strife
Who shall be Master : but i' th end hands shooke
For that they have a Mistresse to theyr Booke.*

FRA: LANTON.³

So much congratulation upon her achievement as reflecting honour upon her sex must have been gratifying to Alice Sutcliffe (and her husband), who in her dedicatory letter to Katherine, Duchess of Buckingham, and Susan, Countess of Denbigh, expresses fear for the reception of her book because of her sex :

Where first, I most humbly crave of You to passe a favourable *Censure* of my proceedings, it beeing, I know not usuall for a *Woman* to doe such things : yet ELIHA sayth, *There is a Spirit in Man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giueth them Vnderstanding.* And it is sayd againe : *Out of the mouthes of Babes and Sucklings, thou shalt perfect Praise.* I am

¹ Sig. a5 (v)—a6 (r). May's tribute is given in its entirety.

² Sig. a8 (r and v). First six lines omitted.

³ Sig. a9 (r and v). The concluding twenty-eight lines omitted.

assured, I shall meet with mocking *Ishmaels*, that will carpe at *Goodnesse*; wherefore, I runne to Your selves for *refuge*; humbly craving to bee assisted by your *Graciousnesse*, which will appeare as the Splendant *Sunne* to disperse those *Mists*.

In her introductory acrostic to Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, she writes similarly :

Poore are my weake endeavours, yet if you,
Encourage my *Minervaes* infant Muse
My cherisht thoughts, by that, may frame anew
Booke of true thanks, unto your Lordships use :
Right Noble then, view but the vertuous tract,
Of this small Volume, and if you shall finde,
Ought good expressed, by our Sexes act,
Know honor'd Lord, my starres are very kinde.¹

The relation of Alice Sutcliffe to the Duchess of Buckingham was intimate, as her dedicatory letter later reveals :

And for that you have beene more then a *Mother* to mee, I having onely from her received life, but next under God from your Grace, & your honorable *Sister* the being both of mee and mine.²

Not a great deal besides can be told about her. She is described as the daughter of Luke Woodhouse of Kimberley in Norfolk,³ but the mother from whom she received "onely . . . life" is not

¹ Sig. a3 (v) The sentiment recurs in the continuation of the acrostic :

MOVNTGOMERY, my Cælique Muse doth mount
On Cherubs wing, from this low Orbe to heaven,
Vertue is here exprest, vices account ;
Nor is't a Tale, or Fable that is given
Truth never is asham'd to shew it's face :
Great man and good, but alwayes loves the light.
O may it then, find an accepted Grace
More cause a woman, did the same indite,
Even then as DEBORAH's sweet tuned song,
Rung out her sacred Peale, in holy Writ :
O so, I pray my heart, my pen, my tongue,
Yea all my faculties, may follow it :

Sig. a3 (v) and a4 (r).

² The *Sister* here named is Susan, Countess of Denbigh, Buckingham's sister, included in the dedication. It is not unlikely that the marriage with John Sutcliffe was arranged for Alice by the Duchess of Buckingham, for the Duke of Buckingham in 1627 had an "ancient servant," John Sutcliffe, who was doubtless related to the younger Sutcliffe (*Cal. S. P. Dom.*, Charles I, 1627-1628, p. 491).

³ *Harl. MS.* 1052, ff. 147-48; *Familia Minorum Gentium*, p. 541, *Harl. Soc.*, vols. xxxvii-xxxviii; *Lincolnshire Pedigrees*, iii, 937, *Harl. Soc.*, vol. lii. All pedigrees of the Sutcliffes. Luke Woodhouse received confirmation of arms in 1615. *Add. MS.* 12,225, f. 244; *Harl. MS.* 6140, f. 79; *Grantees of Arms to the End of the XVII Century*, p. 286, *Harl. Soc.*, vol. lxvi. Blomefield makes no mention of Luke or his daughter Alice in the Woodhouse pedigree, *History of Norfolk*, ii, 558. Nor are they mentioned in the *Visitation of Norfolk* in 1563, 1589, 1613, *Harl. Soc.*, vol. xxxii; nor in the Woodhouse pedigrees in *Harl. MS.* 1552, ff. 44, 136.

named in the record. Sometime before 1624 she was married to John Sutcliffe, son of Solomon Sutcliffe¹ of Mayroid² in Yorkshire and of Grimsby in Lincolnshire, and nephew of the well-known Dean of Exeter, Dr. Matthew Sutcliffe.³ In 1624 John Sutcliffe, then described as "Esquire to the body of James I," obtained confirmation of his arms.⁴ He was married to Alice Woodhouse, and there was a daughter Susan. Alice Sutcliffe was young enough in 1633, however, for Lanton to speak of her youth as giving her "no Sybills name." After the death of James I, John Sutcliffe became, as the title-page states, groom of the Privy Chamber of Charles I.⁵ Because of her husband's position Alice must have known the courts of James I and Charles I, and thus have had opportunity for acquaintance with important people of the day. Whether she knew Ben Jonson personally cannot be said. Wither states definitely that he had never seen her, and Lanton also says :

For I ne're knew her, when I framed this.
Onely I read her lines. . . .

Of her subject so reassuringly received, she says :

I have chosen a *subject* not altogether *Pleasing*; but my ayme is, that it may prove *Profitable*, having observed in this short course of my Pilgrimage, how apt *Man* is, not to thinke of his *Mortalitie*, which stealeth upon him as a *Thiefe in the night*.⁶

*Meditations of Man's Mortalitie*⁷ has a prose discussion of 140 pages in which the transitoriness and baseness of our present life and the permanence and glory of the next are presented. Man is urged not to delay repentance for his sinful state, and having

¹ Solomon Sutcliffe was married to Elizabeth Bradley. He was third son of John Sutcliffe and Margaret Holdsworth. The will of this John Sutcliffe (1577), *North Country Wills*, ii, 82, Surtees Soc., vol. cxxi, describes him as being "of Wellow in the county of Lincoln, yoman . . . and Wadsworth, in the county of York." His property was of a considerable amount. Solomon Sutcliffe was Mayor of Grimsby in 1598, 1599, 1603, 1608. *Lans. MS.* 207a, f. 527. Thus they were people of standing.

² See p. 1, n. 3.

³ See Frances B. Troup, "Biographical Notes on Doctor Matthew Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter, 1588-1629." *Reports and Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature, and Art*, xxii, 171-96.

⁴ *Harl. MSS.* 1052, ff. 147-48; 1422, f. 55; *Add. MS.* 12,225, f. 212. Burke, *The General Armory*, p. 986.

⁵ There are references to petitions in 1633 and 1634 from "John Sutcliffe his Majesty's servant" (*Cal. S. P. Dom.*, Charles I, 1633-1634, pp. 387, 396).

⁶ Dedicatory letter. Sig. A5 (r and v).

⁷ *A Meditation of Mans Mortalitie* (1621) by William Bradshaw, except for the title and the religious nature of both books, has no particular similarity to Alice Sutcliffe's book.

accepted salvation by means of the sacrifice of Christ, to welcome death as the means of entering heaven. Chapter VI, "That Man ought to bee wonne to follow Godlinesse, in respect of the Eternall Happinesse," is given as a specimen of her prose :

Having now set before thee, Life and good, Death and evill (*Deut.* 30) : I desire thee, to choose Life, that both thou and thy seed mayest live, for having beheld, the deceiveableness of worldly pleasures, and how this momentary felicity is attended on, by sorrow and her Confederates, me thinks thou shouldest be weary of this house of Clay, scituated in a Wildernes of miseries, which hourelly produceth Monsters, that ravenously seeketh to prey on thy destruction : and withdrawing thy mind from these fleeting delights, elevate thy thoughts to Heaven, and contemplate with thy selfe, of those Cœlestiall pleasures ; note the beauty of the place, the gloriousnesse of the company, and the durableness of that Happinesse, which is Eternity ; for the beautie of this place, this Heavenly *Ierusalem*, looke into the *Revelation* (*Revel.* 21), and thou shalt finde ; It hath the glory of God, the light thereof to be like Jasper stone, cleere as Chrystall ; glorious must it needs bee, when the Wall is of Iasper, and the City of pure gold, cleare like glasse, and the Foundations of the Wall garnished with all manner of precious stones ; the twelve Gates were twelve Pearles ; every severall gate, was of one pearle ; for the company, there (*Revel.* 15)¹ are Angels, and Martyrs, with the foure and twenty Elders, that offer up golden Vials full of odours, which are the Prayers of Saints ; but, which is chiefe of all delights, there will be God himselfe, who will bee a Looking-Glasse to the eyes of his Elect, Musicke to theyr eares, Nectar and Ambrosia to their Palates, odoriferous Balsamum to theyr Smelling ; There thou shalt see, the variety and beauty of the seasons, the pleasantnesse of the Spring, the brightnesse of Summer, the fruitfulnessse of Autumne, and the quiet of Winter, and there shall bee whatsoever may delight thy senses, and every faculty of thy Soule ; there will be, the fulnesse of light to thy understanding, the abundance of Peace to thy will, and the continuance of Eternity to thy memory ; there, the Wisedome of SALOMON, shall seeme ignorance ; there, the beauty of ABSASOM shall seeme deformity ; there, the strength of SAMPSON, shall seeme weaknesse ; there, the long life of METHVSALEM, shall seeme a span ; there, the Riches of CRÆSVS, shall seeme drosse : for there, thou mayst worthily call the treasures of all Emperors and Kings, starke poverty and beggery.

These things beeing thus ? Why shouldest thou O man ! delight to begge, and live of Almes, when thou shalt finde such abundance in Heaven, looke upon thy selfe and consider, how the Lord hath bestowed upon thee a countenance of Majesty, with thy face erected towards Heaven, and thy eye-lids to move upwards, thereby to teach thee, that thou wert not formed, to spend thy dayes in the moiling cares of this troublesome world, but to aspire to that true Happiness, that maketh all the other Misery.

¹ The correct reference should be Rev. 5.

Marke the Sea-mans Needle, whose nature of that Iron is, that in what part it hath touched the Loadstone, that part alwayes looketh towards the North, and remaineth unsettled, til it hath found the Pole: even so hath God created Man, and hath infused into him a naturall inclination and readinesse, that hee should alwayes looke to his Maker, as to the Pole and onely true happines. . . .

The prose discourse is followed by a didactic poem in decasyllabic rhymed couplets of eighty-eight stanzas of six lines each, bearing the title:

Of our losse by ADAM, and our gayne by CHRIST; The first *Adam* was made a living Soule, the second *Adam* a quickning Spirit; For as in ADAM wee all dye, so in CHRIST, shall all be made alive.—1 *Corinth*. 15.

With laborious effort the verses begin:

God by his Wisedame, and all-seeing Pow'r
Ordained Man vnto Eternitie,
Sathan through malice, turnes that sweet to sowre,
Man eating the forbidden Fruit must Die:
No remedy was left to scape this Curse,
The sore still looked on became the worse.

He out of that delightsome place is throwne
To travell in the World with woe distrest,
Through all his life a Pilgrim he is knowne,
With Cares and Sorrowes, and with griefes opprest:
The more he looks into his wretched state,
The more he rues his fact but all too late.

The progress of the poem may be noted from the following stanzas¹:

Which way, can you recouer this your losse?
What friend have you, that will this great debt pay?
Can you gaine, pure gold from filthy drosse?
Or have you power to call against that Day;
No, you are in a laborinth of woe,
And endlesse is the maze in which you goe.

Pride, of all other sembleth most the Divell:
'Twas Pride, threw Sathan downe from Heaven to Hell:
'Twas Pride, that Author was of all mans euill:
'Twas Pride, made EVE desire still to excell;
When Sathan said, as Gods, you then shall be;
Incontinent, she tasted of that Tree.

Nature and Sathan, are sworne Brothers still,
For neyther of them moveth man to good;
By Nature, we incline to all that's ill,
Which runneth through our body with our blood:
And by our Nature oft he vs assailes,
And through our weaknesse he oft times prevails.

¹ On pp. 149, 160, and 163 respectively.

Such was the author, such the book which these poets thought worthy of commending by their verses. Her book, like many another by women of her period, is now quite forgotten. Like many of them it is religious in intention. Its merit to-day lies perhaps chiefly in the fact that it has preserved poems of better known writers. Taken with the mass of other books by women in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, this volume has significance in the cultural history of the women of the period ; but that point cannot be gone into here.

WRITINGS ASCRIBED TO JOHN FORD BY JOSEPH HUNTER IN *CHORUS VATUM*.

By M. JOAN SARGEAUNT

As far as I am aware, attention has never been called to Hunter's references in *Chorus Vatum* to the dramatist, John Ford.¹ Some of these are of considerable interest, and it is proposed here to call attention to two of them—his suggestions that a piece of verse, *Christ's Bloody Sweat*, and a prose pamphlet, *The Golden Mean*, are by Ford.

I

In his account of Ford in Vol. III of *Chorus Vatum*, Hunter writes :

"Mr. B. H. Bright was convinced that a Poem entitled *Christ's Bloody Sweat* or the *Son of God in His Agony*, 1613, of which there is a copy in the Malone Collection, No. 297, was by Ford. The dedication to Will, Earl of Pembroke, is signed J. F. and he perceives strong points of resemblance between it and the dedication of *The Broken Heart* and *Tis Pity She's &c.*"

This is the extent of Hunter's evidence : but before examining it or looking further, it may be as well to give some brief description of the poem, as copies of it are doubtless rare : the only one that I know of is that referred to by Hunter.²

Christes Bloodie Sweat, Or the Sonne of God In His Agonie, was entered on the Stationers' Register on May 23, 1613, and printed in the same year. The name of the author is not given on the title-page, but the dedication, to the Earl of Pembroke, is signed "I.F."

The work is a religious poem, containing 318 six-line stanzas, of no very great poetic merit. If the author was really John Ford it is not easy to think of more than two reasons why he should have written it. It must have been either to make money or as a sincere expression of belief, or possibly both.

¹ British Museum, Additional MS. 24489.

² Bodleian Library, Malone, 297.

It is difficult to believe that the first of these motives alone can have actuated Ford. That he had from time to time debts is true,¹ but it would hardly have been worth while to have tried to make money in this way, and the poem itself, though it reaches no very high artistic level, strikes one as perfectly sincere. Assuming that this is so, it is extremely interesting to examine the verses to see what can be learnt from them of the mind of the writer.

The author states that he has undergone a definite religious conversion. In his prefatory address: "To such as shall peruse this Booke," he writes: "*I confesse, I have, touching my perticular, beene long carried with the doubts of folly, youth and opinion, and as long miscaried in the darknesse of unhappinesse, both in invention and action. This was not the path that led to a contented rest, or a respected name.*"

In the poem itself he describes how he is called on by the voice of God to write of Christ's sufferings.

Thou (quoth it) that hath spent thy best of dayes
In thriftlesse² rimes (sweet bayts to poyson Youth)
Led with the wanton hopes of laude and praise,
Vaine shadowes of delight, seales of untruth,
Now I impose new taskes upon thy Pen,
to shew my sorrowes to the eyes of Men.

The subject of the poem, then, is Christ's Agony (the actual death and cross of Christ are seldom referred to), and how sinners may be saved by partaking in that Agony. This salvation is only possible through an intense and earnest repentance, expressed in tears. By this means alone can they bathe in Christ's bloody sweat and be cleansed. There is no other means to be saved.

Such is the main argument of the poem. There are various elaborations, such as the enumeration of different kinds of sins, and a description of the guilty soul, but all centre round this point. There is a passage on the error of making Love a god, and of the happiness of the married state.

Love is no god, as some of wicked times
(Led with the dreaming dotage of their folly)
Have set him forth in their lascivious rimes,
Bewitch'd with errors, and conceits unholy:
It is a raging blood affections blind,
Which boiles both in the body and the mind.

¹ See *R.E.S.*, vol. viii, 1932 (No. 29, January), pp. 69-71. "John Ford at the Middle Temple," M. J. S.

² Emended from "thirstlesse."

But such whose lawfull thoughts, and honest heat,
 Doth temperately move with chaste desires,
 To choose an equall partner, and beget
 Like comforts by a like inkindled fires :
 Such find no doubt in union made so even,
 Sweet fruits of succors, and on earth a heaven.¹

The extreme emphasis on personal salvation and of one particular side of the atonement—the saving virtue of Christ's Blood—suggest a "revivalist" type of religion. In the one verse that expresses any very definite doctrinal view, the author is revealed as a Calvinist assured of the salvation of the faithful and repentant through the blood of Christ, but believing at the same time that there were some to whom God's grace did not extend, souls predestined to everlasting damnation :—

Yet neither did the *Death* or *Bloodie sweat*
 Of *Christ*, extend to soules ordain'd to Hell :
 But to the chosen, and elect, beget
 A double life, although the Scriptures tell
 How this meeke *Lambe of God* did chiefly come
 To call the lost sheepe, and the strayers home.

Such are the beliefs expressed in the poem. From a literary point of view it is of no very great value, but it is better than Ford's poem of an earlier date—*Fames Memoriall*. The part in which the author pictures the parent telling the child the story of Christ's sufferings shows some dramatic feeling :

A lovely *Sonne* (my childe) a daintie boy,
 Who had a cheek as red as any cherie,
 Sweete babie, was his mothers only joy,
 And made her heaveie heart full often merie :
 Who, though he were Gods Son, yet like a stranger,
 Hee in a Stable borne was, in a Manger.

And poore, God knowes he was, (my childe) not fine,
 Or like a gentleman in gay attyre :
 But simple clothes hee had, which was a signe
 How little to be proud, hee did desire :
 Yet if hee would have sought for worldly grace,
 Hee might have gone in silke, and golden lace.²

Bright, as quoted by Hunter, refers to the likeness of style in the dedication of this poem to that of Ford's dedications to the *Broken Heart* and *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. The general likeness of style to these, and to other dedications and to Ford's pamphlet *The Line of Life* is noticeable at once. Certain passages are perhaps outstanding :

¹ *Christes Bloodie Sweat*, p. 37.

² *Ibid.*, p. 58.

Right Honorable, as your Titles doe ennoble your Vertues, so (in the Judgement of those that know you) your Vertues doe as much more intitle your Noblenesse : which two, in this age, doe so seldome meete in one, as most usually to bee Great, and to bee Good, is required a double person. . . . These assurances, have encouraged mee, to offer to your judicious view, this little labour, which contains but a Summarie of the Sonne of Gods sorrowes, Wherein, let mee crave this favour from your Noble bountie, to measure, with the defect in writing, the sweetnesse of what is written. . . .

With this may be compared a short passage from the dedication to the *Broken Heart*, and another from that to *Perkin Warbeck* :

My Lord : The glory of a *great name*, acquired by a greater glory of *Action*, hath in all ages liv'd the truest chronicle to his owne Memory. In the practise of which Argument, *your growth* to perfection (even in youth) hath appear'd so sincere, so unflattering a *Penneman* ; that Posterity cannot with more delight read the merit of *Noble endeavours*, then *noble endeavours* merit thanks from Posterity to be read with delight. . . .

. . . I can onely acknowledge, the errorrs in writing, mine owne ; the worthinesse of the *Subject written*, being a perfection in the Story, and of It. . . .

So far the likeness is clear, but seeing that the style is in itself conventional, the resemblance might be accidental, and it remains to find any further corroborative evidence for the identification of "J.F." with John Ford the dramatist.

The Earl of Pembroke was one of the four knights defenders of the four positions of the Peer's challenge on which Ford wrote his *Honour Triumphant*, and the whole pamphlet was dedicated to the Countess of Pembroke and Montgomery. This fact has, however, very little value as evidence, considering Pembroke's fame as a patron of letters.

A first quick reading of the poem supplies two main incentives for further investigation. The first is a general resemblance in form and style to *Fames Memoriall* (though *Christes Bloodie Sweat* is much simpler and not such a labour to read) in spite of the differences of the subject. The other is a striking parallel passage to part of one of the Friar's speeches in *'Tis Pity*. This occurs in a description of the tortures of the damned.

Here shall the *wantons* for a downy bed,
Be rackt on pallets of stil-burning steele :
Here shall the *glutton*, that hath dayly fed,
On choice of daintie diet, hourelly feele
Worse meat then toads, and beyond time be drencht
In flames of fire, that never shalbe quencht.

Each moment shall the *killer*, be tormented
 With stabbes¹ that shall not so procure his death :
 The *drunkard* that would never be contented
 With drinking up whole flagons at a breath,
 Shalbe deni'd (as he with thirst is stung)
 A drop of water for to coole his tongue.

The *mony-hoarding Miser* in his throat
 Shall swallow molten lead :²

When the Friar is persuading Annabella to repentance, he also describes the torments of hell :

in this place

Dwell many thousand, thousand sundry sorts
 Of never dying deaths ; there damned soules
 Roare without pittie, there are Gluttons fedd
 With Toades and Addars ; there is burning Oyle
 Powr'd downe the Drunkards throate, the Userer
 Is forc't to suppe whole draughts of molten Gold ;
 There is the Murtherer for-ever stab'd,
 Yet can he never dye ; there lies the wanton
 On Racks of burning steele, whiles in his soule
 Hee feeles the torment of his raging lust.³

Professor Sherman, in a note on this passage, in his edition of *'Tis Pity*, suggests that it contains reminiscences of *Pierce Penniless*.

A place of horror, stench and darknesse, where men see meat but can get none, or are ever thirstie, and readie to swelt for drinke, yet have not the power to taste the coole streames that runne hard at their feet . . . he that all his life time was a great fornicator, with all the diseases of lust continually hanging upon him . . . as so of the rest as the usurer to swallow molten gold, the glutton to eat nothing but toades, and the Murtherer to be still stabd with daggers but never die.

The ideas behind all these passages are, of course, familiar enough, but the extreme likeness of the list of tortures in *'Tis Pity* to that in *Christes Bloodie Sweat*, suggests that if the poem is not by Ford, he must have used the passage in *'Tis Pity* ; the author of the poem may very likely have been indebted to Nash in the first place.

It is not very easy to make a comparison of *Christes Bloodie Sweat*, either with the plays or *Fames Memoriall*. The earlier poem, though with resemblances in form and style, is totally unlike in subject-matter, and the plays are, on the whole, different in style, and, at first sight, it might seem would yield little from the point of view of subject-matter. A comparison with the Friar's speeches

¹ "Stabbes" emended from "stables."

² *Christes Bloodie Sweat*, pp. 26-27.

³ *'Tis Pity*, Act III, Sc. iii.

in *'Tis Pity*, however, yields some definite results and suggests likenesses in the other plays.

The central idea of the poem is very simple. Man, through his sins, has aroused God's just wrath, which can only be appeased, and His love redeemed, by the death of His Son. This is the preliminary argument, but it is not chiefly of the death of Christ that J.F. writes, and the Crucifixion is barely referred to. His subject is "Christ's Bloody Sweat"—the Agony of the Son of God. This sweat of blood is the sign of Christ's agony of repentance for the sins of the world. Every sinner can be saved by partaking of this agony by his own intense repentance; and the sign of this repentance is tears. Nothing else will avail towards his forgiveness.

He who can gush out teares as twere a flood,
Of christall sorrows, and a zeale unfained,
Doth purge his faults in *Christ* his sweat of blood,
And with his faults shal never more be stained,
Stars in their brightnes shal not shine so glorious,
Nor all the Kings on earth be so victorious.

'Tis not enough to reade the Bible over
Here to fold downe a leafe, and there to quote it,
Now to behold the Lord in blood, then hover
And range: but freely in thy heart to note it:
For where the *Word* doth tel us *Christ* did bleed,
And sweat, there must our thoghts both drink & feed.¹

There are many more passages like this and, expanded and elaborated, it is the theme of the whole poem. Now Mr. Dugdale Sykes has pointed out the frequency with which the idea of guilt as a stain (or leprosy) to be "washed off" with tears occurs in Ford's plays.²

The idea itself is common enough, but what is here remarkable is that it not only appears very frequently in Ford's plays, but it is almost the only definitely religious idea that he often makes use of. Any sin can be atoned for if it is washed off with tears—"and if't bee possible—of blood." This is the substance of the Friar's counsel to the lovers in *'Tis Pity*. Hence the frequent occurrence in Ford's plays, pointed out by Mr. Dugdale Sykes, of the word *penance*—repentance. There is only one hope left for Giovanni:

. . . wash every word thou utter'st
In teares, (and if't bee possible) of blood:
Begge Heaven to cleanse the leprosie of Lust
That rots thy Soule . . .³

¹ *Christes Bloodie Sweat*, p. 39.

² See *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama*, p. 197.

³ *'Tis Pity*, Act I, Sc. i.

When Giovanni finds that in spite of all his tears he still loves Annabella, he feels entirely hopeless :

I have even wearied heaven with prayers, dried up
The spring of my continuall teares, even sterv'd
My veines with dayly fasts : what wit or Art
Could Counsaile, I have practiz'd ; but alas
I find all these but dreames, and old mens tales
To fright unsteady youth ; I'me still the same,
Or I must speake, or burst ; tis not I know,
My lust ; but tis my fate that leads me on.¹

Again in Act III, Sc. iii, the Friar exhorts Annabella to tears :

You have unript a soule, so foule and guilty,
As I must tell you true, I marvaile how
The earth hath borne you up, but weepe, weepe on,
These teares may doe you good ; weepe faster yet. . . .

and Annabella writes her final repentance to her brother in "teares and blood."

Such passages naturally occur most frequently in *'Tis Pity*, since the Friar is the one conventionally religious character drawn with such detail in the plays of Ford. Other examples, however, do occur : in *Love's Sacrifice* and in a particularly noteworthy passage in the *Broken Heart*, where Penthea only believes in Ithocles' repentance of his treatment of her when he calls to witness his tears :

. . . Trouble not
The fountaines of mine eyes with thine owne story,
I sweat in blood for't.

Ford has so often been assumed, too hastily, in the opinion of the present writer, to be an apostle of free love, and the frequency with which he treats of the theme of happy marriage in his plays overlooked, that the sentiments on love and marriage expressed in *Christes Bloodie Sweat* might seem to some very unlikely views to be held by the author of *'Tis Pity*. The question is, unfortunately, far too long to discuss here, but it may be noticed that Giovanni refers to the deification of Love as a recognised sin against Religion.

O that it were not in Religion sinne,
To make our love a God, and worship it.²

Compare *Christes Bloodie Sweat*, p. 37 :

Love is no god, as some of wicked times
(Led with the dreaming dotage of their folly)
Have set him fourth. . . .

¹ *'Tis Pity*, Act I, Sc. iii.

² *Ibid.*, Act I, Sc. iii.

These are, I think, the most important comparisons with the plays to be noticed. Certain forms peculiar to Ford which are a useful piece of evidence in studying his work in *The Queen* and in parts of the *Spanish Gipsy* are to be found in the dramas rather than in the other poems; but the word "pearle," which occurs once in *Christes Bloodie Sweat*, is there dissyllabic in the manner of Ford.

The pearle and the treasures which the Lord . . .¹

A careful comparison of this poem with *Fames Memoriall* reveals a great number of similar tricks of style. These might, of course, be accidental, and must be considered in conjunction with the other resemblances. The most noticeable is the extreme passion for various forms of repetition indulged in in both poems. It will be simpler to classify some examples:

- (a) Beginning the first line of several stanzas with the same phrase, e.g.:

Fames Memoriall, D3^{r&v}, five stanzas begin: "True virtue grac'd his mind . . ."

Christes Bloodie Sweat, pp. 11-14, there are ten beginning: "Here saw he . . ."

Christes Bloodie Sweat, p. 19, three beginning: "Christes Bloody sweate. . ."

- (b) Repeating the same phrase or idea that occurred in the last line of one stanza in the first line of the next,² e.g.:

Fames Memoriall, B2^{r&v},

No poet can grace him, he every poet.
None him, He all can grace . . .

Fames Memoriall, D1^v,

The newes was happy, but for hir to late.
To late for her and for our Lord to late . . .

Christes Bloodie Sweat, p. 1,

Whose price is life, which life, death underproppes.
Death underpropp's that life . . .

Christes Bloodie Sweat, p. 10,

He lost his life; and yet he knew no sin.
He knew no sinne, . . .

¹ *Christes Bloodie Sweat*, p. 31.

² This is analogous to Ford's habit in the plays of making one speaker repeat the last words of the previous speaker.

- (c) Sometimes the repetition takes the form of a question, *e.g.* :

Fames Memoriall, D₄^v,

With meekenesse bearing sorrows sad disgrace.
A sad disgrace ? . . .

Christes Bloodie Sweat, p. 17,

Not foode nor *Mamma*, that shall perish, waste,
Or stincke, but bread that shall for ever last.
For ever last ? . . .

- (d) Making several consecutive verses end with the same, or similar line, or lines, *e.g.* :

Fames Memoriall, E₄^{r&v}, four consecutive stanzas end :

Then ever shall while dates of times remaine,
The heavens thy soule, the earth thy fame contayne.

Christes Bloodie Sweat, p. 24, five stanzas end with the following, or very similar lines :

When they were clad Gods glory for to see,
The only wordes he us'd, were *follow mee*.

- (e) A far more elaborate form of repetition within the stanza itself, *e.g.* :

Fames Memoriall, G₃^r,

Dye portly hunger of eternity
Dye hott desires of unbounded pleasure,
Dye greedines of false prosperity,
Dye giddie solace of ill suted leisure,
Dye hopes of hoorded canker-eaten treasure
Ambition, Empire, glory, hopes and joy
For ever dye, for death will all destroye.

Christes Bloodie Sweat, p. 36 :

Dull eares who will not listen to this call ?
Dull eyes who will not see this fount of ease ?
Dull heart that will not shun temptations gall ?
Dull soule that will not seeke this God to please ?
Dul cares, dul eyes, dul heart, dul soule, whose strife
Nor heares, nor sees, nor thinks, nor seeks for life.

It would be possible to give numerous other examples, but enough have already been given to show the likeness of the manner of these two poems.

It is possible, then, to sum up such evidence as has been used for Ford's authorship of this poem. The dedication, written to one of his known patrons, in the style of his other dedications, is signed "I.F." There is one striking parallel (a passage of some

length) to a passage in *'Tis Pity*. The central idea of the poem is the one religious idea that occurs with great frequency in Ford's plays. The word "pearl," as always in Ford's verse, is dissyllabic. The poem is written in the same manner and style as *Fames Memoriall*. It is, I think, fair to say that there is a strong probability that *Christes Bloodie Sweat* was written by John Ford.

II

In the kind of dedicatory letter, addressed to the "Wise and therein Noble," and prefixed to Ford's pamphlet *The Line of Life*, in the edition of 1620 the following passage occurs :

In all things, no one thing can more requisitely bee observed to be practised, then The Golden Meane : The exemplification whereof, however heretofore attributed, I dare not so poorely vnder-value myselfe and labours, as not to call mine.

I suggest that "*The exemplification whereof*" refers to a prose pamphlet published anonymously in 1613, entitled *The Golden Meane*, and of which a second edition, "Enlarged by the first Author," appeared in 1614.

In the index to Vol. III of *Chorus Vatum*,¹ Hunter writes :

In a Catalogue of Kerslake of Bristol 1757 is *The Golden Meane*, Enlarged by the first author as it was formerly written to the Earl of Northumberland by John de la Ford—2nd Edit Jeff. Chorlton 1614—12^{mo}. is this John Ford ?

I have been unable to trace a copy of Kerslake's Catalogue here referred to, but it seems probable that Hunter, who was extremely painstaking in his recording of evidence, has given us all the information that could be gained from it. What further evidence is there of Ford's authorship of this pamphlet ?

As far as I am aware, his name never appears as "John de la Ford" in any of the printed editions of the dramatist's works, but there is in the British Museum a manuscript version of *The Line of Life*,² of which the dedication to Viscount Doncaster is signed "John de la Forde." Neither the first, nor the second edition of *The Golden Meane*³ contains a dedication, but the title-page of the 1614

¹ British Museum, Add. MS. 24489.

² MS. Lansdowne, 350.

³ The copies of the pamphlet referred to here are those in the Bodleian Library, 8° s. 14 Art. (1613), and Antiq. g.E.1. (1614).

edition describes the work as having been "formerly written to the Earle of Northumberland." This must have been the Earl of Northumberland then imprisoned in the Tower, who was father-in-law to the Viscount Doncaster, to whom *The Line of Life* is dedicated in the manuscript version to which reference has already been made.

In manner, form and style *The Golden Meane* resembles very closely the *Line of Life*. It is impossible here to quote at sufficient length to illustrate this point fully, but I think that a reading of the two pamphlets must justify the assertion. Like the later pamphlet it lays down certain laws for the conduct of the life of a virtuous man, with the same stress on such stoical virtues as the disregard of fortune and equilibrium of mind in untoward circumstances. As in *The Line of Life* the author illustrates his points by reference to characters of ancient history and of contemporary and fairly recent English history. In showing how such temporal blessings as wealth, honour, kingdom, are all subject to "monthly, daily, hourly alteration," he chooses as his examples Pompey, Sejanus and Ptolemy, Wolsey and Essex.

The reference to "Robert, Earle of Essex, propt up in honours and cast downe by envie" recalls the passage in *The Line of Life* where the example of Essex is used to illustrate the statement that "the pestilence, the rigour of law, famine, sickness, or war, have not devoured more great ones than flattery and envy," and where he is described as "a man supereminent in honours." It will, of course, be remembered that Essex's brother-in-law, the Earl of Devonshire, is the subject of Ford's first known publication, *Fames Memoriall*, which is dedicated to his sister, the Countess of Devonshire, and which contains also a reference to Essex. Here again it is envy that is made to account for the fall of Devereux:

Renownd *Devoreux*, whose aukward fate,
Was misconceited by fowle envies hate: . . .

A small point, but one worthy of notice, is the use of the word "float" meaning "flood" as contrasted with ebb in *The Golden Meane*.¹

A man in the float of prosperitie to feare that he may fall, argues both the distrust of his owne merite, or the danger of his disposition. A man in the ebbe of his plenty, to feare a worse mischiefe then that of being poore or despised, argues both his unworthinesse in procuring, and his impatiencie in bearing his fortune.

¹ First edition, p. 7.

The late Dugdale Sykes, in an article on Ford's possible authorship of *The Spanish Gipsy*¹ referring to a passage in this play where the word is so used, wrote: "Nowhere else, outside Ford's dramatic works, have I found 'float' in this sense. Ford has it at least three or four times."

It is only fair to say that the use of the word "float" in this sense, though rare, is not confined to Ford. The *O.E.D.* gives a few other examples, including Bacon's *Henry VII*,² p. 139: "He being now in the float for treasure," and Fuller's *Holy and Profane State*, ii, xxi, p. 141: "Men of his profession have as well an ebbe of riot as a flote of fortune."

Finally, I would quote the conclusion of *The Golden Meane*:

Wisedome informes the minde, and NOBLESSE commends the actions; insomuch as every one who can act wisely, and deliberate Nobly, squaring his resolution to resolvee steaddinesse in both fortunes, may of meritt be inrolled amongst the memorable: and bee remembred by the desertfull to bee truly wise because Noble: to bee perfectly Noble because wise.

The Line of Life, it will be remembered, is addressed to the "Wise, and therein Noble."

I would suggest that any future editor of Ford's works should consider the inclusion in his edition of both *Christes Bloodie Sweat* and *The Golden Meane*.

¹ *Modern Language Review*, 1924, vol. xix, pp. 11-24.

² *Henry VII* was one of Ford's sources for *Perkin Warbeck*, but I do not suggest that this fact is, in the present connection, more than an interesting coincidence.

SIR GEORGE ETHEREGE IN RATISBON

By SYBIL ROSENFELD

THE British Museum has recently acquired the papers of the Earl of Middleton, Secretary of State under James II. Though these have not yet been arranged or catalogued I have, by kind permission of the Keeper of Manuscripts, been enabled as a special privilege to see the material relating to Sir George Etherege.

The Etherege papers are at present in two bundles. The first contains his dispatches from Ratisbon, covering nearly the whole period of his envoyship to the Diet. The second is of little interest from other than the historical point of view, as it consists of copies of newsletters from Vienna, and other official documents, and of letters written to Etherege, or to Hughes, his secretary, from correspondents at the campaign in Hungary.

The Etherege letters are nearly all in holograph, in his clear and beautifully flourished calligraphy, but there are a few addressed to Middleton's secretary, Dr. Wynne, in the handwriting of Hughes, signed by Etherege. There are over 230 letters, a large number of which are either not in the Letterbook at all or are only very briefly summarised therein; whereas, too, the Letterbook finishes at March 1/11, 1688, we now have originals up to October 18/28, 1688.

In comparing the originals with their Letterbook copies it is interesting to note that the earlier ones especially were often altered in Hughes' transcription. Though the sense is the same there are considerable differences in phrasing, and this is particularly noticeable of a letter dated February 22/March 4, 1685/6. Thus Etherege's phrase, "We are still becalm'd here, not the least breese of busenes stirring," appears in the Letterbook as "The Diet sleeps still, and when they will awake I know not." There does not seem to be any ulterior motive behind Hughes' alterations; it looks rather as though he were copying from rough drafts. We know that the Letterbook was not begun until March 5/15, 1686/7, so that the first letters could not have been copied directly from the ones that Etherege actually

sent to England, but were most likely taken from the first drafts of these. After March 8/18, 1685/6, however, the Letterbook versions are very close to the originals, with occasional omissions or slips, such as any copyist might make. Probably Etherege took more pains at the beginning of his career and troubled to improve on his rough drafts, but after a little while, becoming weary, merely copied them. The Letterbook versions would then become almost identical with the originals.

In one case, however, there is a variation in which the malicious intent of Hughes is clearly evident. Etherege's story is as follows:

I return'd in Company of a ffrench Gentleman and seeing the Swedish Minister's Coach at his doore who was then setting forward for the assemblee at Ausburg I went to him and wish'd him a good Journy but the ffrench told him he *wish'd him all prosperity as to himselfe but he cou'd not wish him good success in his business*. Seeing some other Ministers afterwards who came to take their leave of him he told them he had had a very fine complement just then made him on his journy and told them w^t the ffrenchman had said malisciously not distinguishing who had made it. I was surpris'd two days afterwards to heer that the Secretary of Austria maintain'd publicly that it was I that had said these words. I complain'd to the Count de Windishgratz but cou'd have no satisfaction ag^t his Creature but uppon Monsieur Schnolski's returne from Ausburg I oblig'd him to clear the business and on the next visit he shou'd make to the Emperor's Ministers to declare to them that it was a lye, w^{ch} they own'd to me he did accordingly.

Hughes summarised this incident in the Letterbook with his own comment: "the story about the compliment Sir George made to Schnolsky upon his journey to Augsburg (wishing his coach might break on the way because he went with a design of making an alliance against France)."

It is interesting to note also that Hughes, in transcribing the letter of October 17/27, omitted the phrase in which his master gave the opinion that the chief ministers at Vienna had of Windischgrätz: "Who admire him for his great learning in the Institutes, and Codes, but do not much love his haughty and violent temper." Knowing Hughes, we may conclude that this was partiality for Etherege's enemy.

We already know from the Letterbook that Etherege lingered in Holland on his way to Ratisbon where, according to Hughes, he spent his days gambling and making love. His first dispatch to Middleton is dated from the Hague, September 25, old style, in

which he states he had arrived in Holland eight days previously and was intending to stay two or three days longer. He had some business to transact there in connection with a mysterious Mr. D. (doubtless Mr. Dowglass, of the Letterbook, p. 367), which he says in his next from Cologne (October 26/November 5), he had finally to leave to Mr. Skelton, the English Envoy at the Hague. At Utrecht Etherege was attacked by the first of a series of indispositions which he was to suffer during his career abroad; here, too, he took his leave of Skelton. On his way to Cologne he stopped at Cleve to make inquiries about some Englishmen who had been stopping there, but whose names he was unable to ascertain.

Etherege's first letter from Ratisbon is dated November 16/26, 1685. He had arrived on the previous Wednesday "very much tir'd, having rid post about 8 or 9 Stages in very ill wayes and on worse Horses." He had not lost much time and had already seen the French Envoy, M. de Crécy, privately. The Count de Windischgrätz, Etherege's future enemy, was in Vienna occupied in incensing the Emperor against the Electors who opposed his ambition. Etherege characteristically grasped the situation at once:

This Monsieur du Crecy is of opinion is like to make more unnescessary disputes rather then put an end to them and that the Emperor may have occasion to repent the credit he has given to Count Windichgratz. But I find by his discourse he has allwayes been ill wth the Count and is very well wth most of the Electorall Colledge.

These early dispatches show Etherege eager to get down to business and to finish with his ceremonious visits. Already in his first dispatch he writes: "By that time this weeke is over I hope to have made most of my Visits, it has cost me all the time I have been here to fitt myselfe in Order to it, and I have allready got a Coach and horses." He is pathetically anxious to give satisfaction, to obtain reliable intelligence, to convey to Middleton what is of real importance. He protests his good intentions in nearly every letter: "I have been very carefull to write to yo^r Lo^p by every oportunity since I have been here and have troubl'd you wth somethings it may be I might have omitted. Correct my faults and they shalbe mended." On November 26/December 6 he begs Middleton to let him have news of England, and a little later he writes: "Tho I do not doubt but I am sometimes in yo^r Lo^{ps} memorie, yet if Mr. Wynne had order from you to let me know it, it wou'd be a good help to my philosophy and ad more to my cheirefulness than the Divertions

of Ratisbon " or again " pray my Lord let me now and then by Mr. Wynne receave some marks of yo^r fauour in this drooping place to cheere up the Spirits of etc." When Middleton did write Etherege was delighted: " The pleasure I had when I receiv'd yo^r Lo^{ps} Letter is yet fresh and I find the least marke of yo^r fauour is able to make Ratisbonne agreable." This was the greatest compliment the poor envoy could pay since it had not taken him many weeks to discover the appalling dullness of life in Ratisbon: " This place is allways as barren of pleasure as it is now of News; wherefore instead of giving you an account of my private affaires, I recommend my selfe to yo^r pittie " (February 7/January 28).

On December 8/18 Windischgrätz arrived back from Vienna, and on December 14/24 Etherege wrote that he had " been to visit the Count de Windischgratz who has receiv'd me very Courteously. The Plenipotentiare of France and the Electoral Colledge will not visit him, he receiving them at the Staires head onely, and taking the Right hand in his owne house w^{ch} they will allow to no Comissioner of the Emperors y^t is not a Prince of the Empire." It is fitting that our first introduction to Etherege's enemy should involve mention of a dispute about etiquette; it did not take Etherege, with his eye for comedy, long to discover that he was " a man of compleat Ceremony."

By the spring of 1686 the novelty had worn off. Etherege no longer so frequently protested his duty and was ready to introduce a little gossip into his official correspondence: " I heare there is a marriage towards And Cuckolds smile in hope of sweet revenge (as an author has it). As soon as I am assur'd of it being compleated, I entend to felicitate the Lusty Bridegroom, having more then ordinarie obligations to do that " (March 11/21).

In April he suffered another " little fit of sickness w^{ch} has held me this week," and in the same dispatch he reports that " Will Herbert, Tho: Cheeks brother in Law, wth one or two more young Sparks, pass'd by this place last week, and are design'd for the Campagne in Hungarie; this Cutting Morecraft promises to make as good an Officer as Falstaff." The passage through Ratisbon of these young men from England must have relieved the monotony of existence for him.

This existence despite, his comic sense breaks out from time to time; he had no one with whom he could laugh and so must needs enliven the news by retailing to Middleton, who for all his high

office was one of his own kind, the story of the Elector of Bavaria's amorous difficulties :

I will venture being impertinent in telling you a Storie of a Case of Conscience w^{ch} happend upon the Elector of Bavaria's Marriage to the Arch-dutches. Kaunitz being the Emperor's Envoyé at Munick the Elector made Love (and scandal says not unsuccessfully) to his wife who is very agreable, and very Gallante (for a Dutch Lady) ; the Emperor knowing the matter, after the marriage, made it be debated in his Council whither he ought not to recall Kaunitz ; but it was urg'd the Elector being young, and of a constitution that wou'd incline him now and then to wrong his faire Princess, it was better to continue Kaunitz and his wife in that Court, she having an ascendant over the Elector's spirit, and being like to keep it by her subtilty, and wit, then by removing her to let him fall into worse hands who may incline him to another interest ; she and her Husband being firmly bound to the Emperor's. Whereuppon Kaunitz was, and is continu'd, and his wife has great power in that Court. I hope yo^r Lo^p will excuse this by-play since I but seldom take the Libertie.

It is just Etherege's facility in hitting off a character, in making a shrewd judgment, and in adding amusing details that makes his official letters so entertaining and so different from the usual run of diplomatic correspondence. Thus Schnolski "is the ablest Minister here for Noise and invention," and at the Nuremberg Congress "the Ministers who have made the most bustle, and noise in this business, seem like men who wou'd set others together by the eares wthout engaging themselves." What other minister would think of writing that "this day he [Lobkowitz] sets forward wth an odder belly than ever had Polichinello," or even that the Diet "meet every day and compl^{mt} one an other till it be time to eate their Sauer Craut." So, thanks to the comedy writer's sense of the ridiculous, his colleagues often flash out at us from the dullest newsletter as they walked and talked and were petty men.

By August 16/26 the envoy was in financial distress : "I have been these two Months little better then broke, and if my Lord Treasurer dos not consider me suddainly I shall be declar'd a Banquerout ; It will be, by that time you receive this, a yeare since I left England ; I have formerly told yo^r Lo^p the Stock I had, by w^{ch} you will be able to judge of my condition, pray do w^t you can to support the Credit of etc." There is record of a payment from the Treasury on August 20 of £546 for November 1685 to May 1686 which must have come as a relief.

The winter again gave Etherege "a little fevor w^{ch} was occasion'd

by a Cold." "I am pretty well recover'd," he writes December 23/January 2, "but shall not be strong enough to venture abroad till next week." This is the time when he first met Julia, and we are fortunate in having the original of the letter of December 30/January 9 in which Etherege sent the Secretary of State the French song he had written to her. He writes: "Tho' Germany be not very fertill in Beauty I have seen a Lady so very handsome as wou'd puzzle most Countrys to match her. She scarcely makes them very cruelle; as you will perceive by the Song I send you; the first and onely one I ever made in french. It is a venture for tho' the Dutch have not abounded in wits, they have had their share of Criticks." Unfortunately this is the only allusion in the correspondence to Etherege's escapade with his actress.

With regard to gaming the Letterbook has a bald summary January 31/February 10 "of the story about his gaming being false." This is what Etherege wrote:

I hope yo^r Lo^p will take a little care of me and speak in my fauour to the Comissioners of the Treasurie. You know my owne Rents come but slowly out of England; there will be near a Thousand pounds due to me for entertainment and extraordinaries by the end of February but my comfort is tho' I have but little mony left I owe nothing in the Empire. I was tax'd by a friend of being guilty of an indiscretion at play but the Storie is false and I find the follies I have committed in that kind were onely the effects of Idles having thought of nothing since my being here but how I might fit my selfe to serve his Ma^{tie}.

The letters of 1687 are mostly in the Letterbook, and those which are not hold little interest except one to Wynne, in which Etherege repeats in other terms his criticisms of the letter to Mr. Guy (Letterbook, p. 294):

The Revolter dos not pleas me so well as the first answer to the Hind & Panther it seems to be writ by an Angrie Clergieman and the other I am confident by some stroks I find in it was writ by a Gentleman who has dipt his hands in Satyr ere now. The Author of the Trage-Comedie while he endeavours to show our ffriend an ill man shows himselfe a very ill Poet.

Did Etherege share a love of the marvellous with his age that prompted him to relate in the same letter of "a very sad accident" in which "one of the handsomest young Gentlewomen in this Towne was struck dead wth the Thunder in a terrible storme w^{ch} was that Day. An other Lady was sitting on the same stole wth

her and was vntouch'd all that appeares is a black streak downe her Chin and a spot on the side of her nose. She is lamented by everybody and her death has put an end to all the Divertions of this place for this Summer " ?

In November Etherege heard some good news : " The Count de Windisgratz is to leave this place in March next and it is said he will be sent Ambassador into Spaine." Actually he had to be borne with, as Etherege later knew to his cost, for another ten months. The man of complete ceremony who had taken up so much of the Diet's time in disputes about his position fought for a last compliment to be paid him.

The trouble started in June 1688 when Etherege reports : " The Count de Windisgratz before he leaves us insists uppon having the Diet make him a farewell Comple^{mt} by a deputation." There was one drawback to Etherege's delight in his departure : " We shall suddainly have the displeasure of loosing the Count de Windisgratz : had they [he and his successor the Margrave of Baden] been to have stay'd together we shou'd not have fail'd of seeing some Scenes more diverting than any you have in y^r new Comedies." The business of the farewell compliment was debated with much heat in the Diet, but in July there was some hope of a settlement : " The Count de Windisgratz has sent away most part of his Equipage and go's himselfe as soon as the Diet has given him their blessing, a Complement at parting, this business is now negociating and the Colledge of Electors who have oppos'd it are inclining to it rather than be troubl'd wth him any longer so that it is said he will have his hearts desire." He achieved it in fact on August 26/September 5, and finally left Ratisbon on September 2/12, Etherege, with we may suspect a touch of irony, reporting the day following : " Yesterday the Count de Windisgratz took his leave of this place and is gone to Vienna to be rewarded for the good service he has done the Emperor here."

Before he left he found opportunity to do Etherege one last bad turn. The Count led Etherege on by speaking of the Prince of Orange's projected invasion of England as " a folly beyond that of the late Duke of Monmoth's." Etherege, who needed only the least encouragement, hereupon spoke of his apprehensions that Bentinck was trying to make alliances in Europe for the Prince. He, of course, asked Windischgrätz not to speak of this part of their conversation, but he continues : " As I left him the Swedish Minister

famous for title tattle and lyeing came in to whom contrary to his promise I find the Comte told part of our discourse." Valkenier, the Dutch envoy, immediately wrote Etherege a letter of protest accusing him of calumnies against the Prince of Orange. Etherege replied in high retaliation and immediately wrote also to the Swedish Minister asking him to point out to his friend Valkenier "*Combien il est dangereux a un Ministre grave et serieux de donner prise aux railleurs,*" and then characteristically adds "*quand vous aurez les pipes en bouche radoucissez vous un peu envers votre ami, c'est la veritable heure du berger, si vous ne le faites pas, que ce tendre moment vous manque quand vous le souhaiterez aupres de quelque belle dans votre jardin.*" In his next to Middleton Etherege wrote mordantly: "*Your Lo^p sees the obligations I have to the Count de Windisgratz; th' I am not ingratfull I do not think it convenient yet awhile to acknowledge his favour.*"

Earlier in the year, too, Windischgrätz had been spreading tales, so that on April 26/May 6 Etherege

accompanied my Lord Carlingford and my Lord Abergaveny as far as Passau where his Brother had given him a meeting, on purpose to be acquainted with my Lord Taaffe and to endeavour to remove by his means some malicious impressions w^{ch} the Count de Windischgratz had made of me, in severall persons when he was last at Vienna. I had notice given me of this ill office by one of the Emperor's Ministers who advis'd me to this journey.

The letters of 1688 are of particular interest since most of them are later than the period of the Letterbook. They reflect Etherege's growing anxiety as to the proposed invasion by the Prince of Orange. From June onwards he is continually writing of rumours that he has heard or of libels against James II that have been circulating. They must have been difficult months for him. At first he took little notice and merely attributed the rumours to the malice of the Dutch ministers who were trying "to make it be beleiv'd in the Empire that great Revolutions will suddainly be seen in England and that no less then a Civill war is uppon the point of breaking out but all prudent men look on this onely as the wishes and lyeing insinuations of hellish and Malignant spirits" (June 18/28).

Etherege's language is apt to become strongly indignant in the face of any such suggestions.

The news of the birth of the Prince of Wales sends him jubilant and seems the end of trouble, since "this great blessing cannot but

fill all honest men wth Joy." He is busy henceforward with plans for his great feast described in the Letterbook. "The Abbot of St James and I," he writes on July 2/12,

have pitch'd on Sunday the 25th S.N. of this instant being St. James's Day for singing the *Te Deum* for the birth of the Prince. This place being the Center of Europe and where there is a confluence of Ministers belonging to most of the Christian Princes it is expected (and indeed necessarie) the rejoycings on so blessed an occasion shou'd be distinguish'd by something Extraordinary. I shall take care (being nevertheless as good a husband as I can) that what is done shall be answerable to the greatness of his Ma^{tie} and the reputation of the Nation. I have already reconcil'd all Religions for that day and none will make difficulty of coming to the Masses and *te Deum* but what is harder to bring about the removing scruples touching Ceremonialls, tho' I have made some progress in it I am still troubl'd in finding out expedients.

That, indeed, it was not all easy we gather from his description after the event :

I am very glad I am able to tell you I am alive and a livelike after the fatigue of above a fortnights care to set my house in order and to p^rpare things necessaire for so great a solemnity as a publique rejoicing for the happy birth of the Prince. On Sunday after the *te deum* I treated the Diet and the foraigne Ministers here ; on Monday I gave a Ball to the Ladys and Cavaliers of the place. . . . All past wthout any other mischiffe then fingers cut many broken heads not a few bloody Noses and an universall bloody Drunkness. . . . In this conjuncture the Count de Windisgratz and I were reconcil'd by the mediation of the Comte de Lamberg and Monsieur de Neuforge the Deputy for Bourgondy ; the Counte made the first advance he having been the cause of the difference. I invited him afterwards to the *te Deum* and feast wth the Marcgrave of Baden. This reconciliation has a little vex'd the Counte de Crecy who did what he cou'd to dissuade me from it, but I thought it better to follow the instructions you gave me w^{ch} was to live well wth all the Ministers. Many Civillitys have pass'd betweene the Count de Windisgratz and me and the Counte de Crecy and I live on the same foot of Friendship wee did tho' he refus'd to come to the feast because the Imperiall Comission was invited and he told me he cou'd not because of their disputes about place ; I answer'd I was not oblig'd to take notice of that uppon w^{ch} he growing a little warme, I bid him consider whether his Ma^{tie} sent me to him or to the Diet.

In the end neither Windischgrätz nor Baden attended because the Deputy for Cologne had been invited, and so Etherege drew thankful breath to be rid of them all : " Since I cou'd not have them I was glad I had not the Count de Crecy for it had not fail'd to have

made a great Noise if he had presided at a feast in the heart of the Empire on this occasion."

Matters did not mend with the birth of an heir to James II. By August it seemed sure that William of Orange would sail for England, and Etherege writes: "Tho' there is scarce now any room left for doubt, the horror of the thing makes many modest in their belief" (August 2/12). There were rumours in September that he had already sailed, whereupon Etherege exclaims: "May this 88 be as fatal to the fleet of this ungratefull snake as the last 88 was to the invinsible Armado of their auncient Master" (September 17/27). He expresses, too, a hope that "the french will fall on the Low cuntry it being the best diversion to our Enemys w^{ch} we can wish." But Louis was busy falling instead on the German states, and is reported in the next dispatch to be besieging Phillipsburg (September 24/October 4).

Etherege was not one to be blinded by the excuses of the Dutch minister in London: "I cannot but be unquiet w^t ever Monsieur van Citers may say in London or Monsieur Fagel at the Hague. It dos not seem probable to me that that great fleet w^{ch} the Hollanders have, on w^{ch} so many men are ship'd besides so many thousand sadles and armes for Horse, shou'd be onely design'd ag^t france when I see Letters w^{ch} I cannot but give credit to w^{ch} say the Town of Amsterdam will not consent to the prohibiting of their Commoditys w^{ch} wou'd be nonsense shou'd the fleet be design'd ag^t them." His gorge rises when he hears a story that the Swedes are ready to assist in the invasion: "I hope the report of the Swedes being embarqu'd to assist in the descent will animate our Countrymen in their Duty the robberies and violence they are guilty of in their invasions being notoriously known" (September 24/October 4).

Rumours became wilder—James was reported to have been assassinated and libels against the new-born Prince were rampant. Etherege cannot for a moment believe in the integrity of the Prince of Orange's purpose: "The P. of O. covers his designe here with the specious pretence of obliging the king to call a free Parliament in Order to confirme the fundamentall Laws of the Kingdom, this cheat is old and obvious yet on the other side it is true that mankind tho' the subtillest of all Animalls is most easely deceiv'd." He proceeds to an outburst of fervent loyalty: "God preserve his Ma^{tie} and bless him wth Victorie as for Mevius Mala soluta navis exit alite I have much adoe to forbear praying all the Ode over."

The poor envoy's position became more and more intolerable : " I hope God," he exclaims, " has discover'd the bottom of this Conspiracy and that his Ma^{tie} know his Enemys." He was aware that the Dutch Minister was praying publicly for the Prince of Orange's success and that a good many of the German ministers sympathised with the enterprise :

You need not wonder that the Elector Palatin's Minister here assists at the prayers w^{ch} are made at Valkenier's for a blessing on that Princes designe, false zealots ever wanting gratitude and comon honesty. Some Roman Catholick Ministers allow the enterprise is unjust, but at the same time they say some publique good may come by it ; I know not w^{ch} of the two are most wicked, they who act on a false principle of Religion or they who give way to their proceedings thro' a politick interest ; I cannot think his Ma^{tie} will be so abandon'd by his people, as is generally beleiv'd here by the reports w^{ch} come from Holland ; the maine bulding is founded on lyes, and that is a foundation w^{ch} is never lasting (October 11/21).

Etherege did his best " to make the Germaines sensible of the trick the P. of O. has played them in employeing the Troops he has drawn out of the Empire to carry on his own designe and not in their defence as was generally expected," but he was devoured with anxiety : " I have not heard from England since the 21th of Sep. : I hope in God the next news I receive will be good " (October 15/25). So as far as this correspondence goes we get our last glimpse of him vituperating the Dutch : " this arrogant nonsense will remain a Record of the Shameless wickedness of their Government."

There were other troubles that year for Etherege besides the Dutch. The Treasury was still dilatory :

I cannot but take it a little ill of Mr. Robson that he is so sparing of his paines in giving me an account how my affaires stand in the Treasury it is now near 5 Moneths since I have had a Letter from him (May 3/13).

His expenses had been allowed in May but in July he still had not received the money :

It has pleas'd th Lords of the Treasury to Order me £550 for two yeares and 3 quarters Extra^{nies} due in May last but Mr. Robson writes me word that he cannot receive it all by reason I have not sent Bills for the wholle time, wherefore I have sent one w^{ch} comprehends all w^{ch} will be presented to you by Mr. Wynne and I humbly beg your Lo^p to allow it, the rest of the mony lyeing ready in the Exchequer.

Etherege was again ill " after having been tormented with a long cold winter, without a kind Spring to prepare us for it, we are lept

into a violent hot summer, wth makes us suffer no less from the other extreame and I begin to be sensible of the unwholesome effects of it already, for finding myself indispos'd last night, I was forc'd to be lett blood this morning by way of prevention" (March 21/31).

The following week he sees a faint hope of escaping for a while from the tediousness of Ratisbon: "When the Baron de Swerin has given notice of the late Elector's death in England and his Ma^{tie} thinks of sending to that Court I beg your Lo^{ps} favor in case I shou'd be thought of. I shou'd be fonder of the Journy if there be any thing to Negociate that I may try my fortune now I have a little experience in affaires." But we hear nothing further of this project.

There are some interesting references to Lady Etherege in two letters to Wynne (March 19/29, 1688): "I hear my wife has been ill of an aguish distemper, wherefore I pray (when you go that way) deliver the letter I enclose for her with your own hands and do me the kindness to say all that is necessary to shew the concern I have for her health and be sure you own: that it was you who gave me notice of her illness"; and again (March 22/April 1): "I hope you will not fail to do what I desir'd you in my Last letter since it concerns my interests at Doctors Commons; as soon as Mr. Robson letts me know how my affaires stand in the Treasury I intend to write to my friends there." We have no other reference to any suit in Doctors Commons. Knowing of the bad relations that existed between Etherege and his wife one is led to wonder whether there were any divorce proceedings pending.

Laziness was a favourite affectation of the age adopted by Middleton and by Etherege alike. Middleton was ill in June and had been sparing of writing, which gives Etherege the opportunity for a little compliment:

For I cannot be in good health when my Patron is attack'd wth sickness by whose favor I have onely a prospect of Living; I shall be glad to learne any way you are grown so lusty again as to be fit for all exercises in good Company but if I had it under your own hand it wou'd make the Joy the greater. It is a wonderfull thing to me you shou'd be so lazie in writing when I consider how active you are on all occasions to do what you can to oblige your ffrinds and what is more even me your poor creature.

He recurs to the subject in a delightful letter to Middleton:

I have allways had (as well as yo^r Lo^p) such an Alacrity in Laziness that I cannot in my heart but approve of the Wisdom of the Diette in proceeding so slowly. . . . We have had severe winter and the Spring hardly

yet begins to smile uppon us, no insect is seen hetherto crawling out of his warme hole but the Marquis of Baden is to be here before Easter. . . . I am beholden to yo^r Lo^p for recommending some Books to our Abbot he promises me I shall have my share of pleasure in the enjoym^t of them ; reading is the most constant and best entertainm^t I have now the conversation I find is as tedious to me as Books were when I had the advantage of good Companie, and I am yet so far from forgetting the relish of it that I wou'd consent to be condem'd to heare the most impertinent Fop this firtill place affords talk a wholle Month togeather to have the satisfaction of being wth you and some of yo^r ffrinds one night in London ; the hope of that happiness one day makes all the cheerfulness of etc.

Here we discover Etherege as a reader, though as one to whom books are a poor substitute for life. He had a great zest for living which he could not altogether suppress in Ratisbon and which partly accounts for his blunders. At the same time it is the yeast which leavens the dry matter of his dispatches and allows us to find in them not a diplomatic machine but a vital personality.

These fresh letters confirm the opinion of him that one forms from reading the Letterbook. As an envoy he possessed the qualities of loyalty and wholehearted devotion to his king. His shrewd intelligence enabled him to see through the pretences of men to their real motives, and through the formalities of diplomacy to the real issues ; but he had no sense of responsibility and no tact, and would say and do foolish things as they came into his head without thought of the consequences. He tried especially in the first months to do what was expected of him, but he failed to adapt himself to the life of the German town or to the political manners of the Empire. After a little he seems to have given up the struggle and to have got what pleasure he could without caring whether or not he outraged his colleagues' susceptibilities. The comic spirit is never far from his dispatches and informs his outlook on people and events throughout. We are left wishing that he could have written the comedy of his own preposterous career as His Majesty's Envoy to the Diet.

THE WOES OF THOMAS DE QUINCEY

By COLEMAN O. PARSONS

In the *Review of English Studies* for April 1933, Miss E. Hamilton Moore presents "Some Unpublished Letters of Thomas De Quincey" from the originals in the possession of William F. Watson's niece, Miss McKay, of Oxtou, Birkenhead. These letters were formerly a part of the Watson autograph collection,¹ which was bequeathed to the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, and in September 1930 was permanently lent to the National Library of Scotland by the Trustees of the National Galleries. De Quincey is still represented in this collection by three letters, the first of which helps to answer Miss Moore's questions: "Did her ladyship relent? Or was 'the rent made worse'?" We do not know."

I

Carolina Oliphant, christened after the king over the water, married William Murray Nairne (later Lord Nairne) in June 1806 and took up her abode in Carolina Cottage (now Nairne Lodge), built for her on the Willowbrae Road, near Duddingston Mill, by a liberal uncle.² Lady Nairne relinquished the cottage a few months after her husband's death (July 1830) and was living in Enniskerry, County Wicklow, Ireland, at the time of De Quincey's occupancy, which began about February 25, 1832, and ended in the early part of May 1833—dates which may be substituted for Mr. Alexander H. Japp's inaccurate statement: "By and by, Mrs. De Quincey came to Edinburgh with the children [in 1830], and they were established first in a cottage at Duddingstone, and then in other parts."³ The rent throughout seems to have been £27 a quarter.

¹ See De Quincey's letter of June 24, 1855, to his daughter Florence, containing a reference to meeting "Mr. Watson of Princes Street, the bookseller, so famous for his unrivalled series of autographs, stretching (I believe) through forty or more folios." A. H. Japp, *Thomas de Quincey: His Life and Writings* (London, 1890), pp. 286-87.

² *Life and Songs of the Baroness Nairne*, ed. the Rev. Charles Rogers (London, 1869), p. xxxii, and William Baird, *Annals of Duddingston and Portobello* (Edinburgh, 1898), p. 467.

³ See A. H. Japp's essay, "Thomas de Quincey: His Friends and Associates," in James Hogg, *De Quincey and His Friends* (London, 1895), p. 56; cf. Japp. *op. cit.*, p. 216.

Tuesday, March 11, 1834.

GENTLEMEN,

Your letter dated March 7 reached me at a very late hour last night ; and, if I understood my son accurately, was not delivered at Caroline Cottage until yesterday March 10. So that it was out of my power to send any earlier answer to it than I now do.

With respect to the balance of £2. 10—still due, as it now appears, on my acceptance, I was not aware that it had not been paid : the payments on that acceptance having been made during my absence in Westmorland. I find however that my son, by some mismanagement finding that he wanted a few shillings of the total amount, thought it best to send a round sum of £20 ; and afterwards forgot to mention the circumstance to me. As to the two months' rent, which had accumulated on the 25th of last month, I really had not adverted to that fact : and naturally enough. The total arrear that would be due to lady Nairne at the very end of my term, even including the £2. 10 [which, not being aware of it, I omitted], would—after deducting, according to your own proposal, one month's rent—have fallen below £40. Viewing this by comparison as a trifle, and allowing myself to suppose that you could feel no further anxiety about an arrear which, on my *then* belief, stood thus—34 guineas + 6 shillings *to pay* against 60 guineas *paid*,—I had ceased to think of the claim with that sort of interest which would else have reminded me of writing to you upon the subject. Under these circumstances it was perfectly right to recal my attention to the affair. But you will pardon me if I do not see the necessity, on a *first* summons, for resorting to menaces. However, to make my answer circumstantially to your demand,—it is not in my power [or not *certainly* in my power] to ensure the £20. 10—within 14 days as you require. For I must then depend entirely upon literary exertion, which is too uncertain [from many accidents to which it is liable] to warrant an absolute engagement. But I will do this : in the first week of April without fail I receive a considerable part of my regular income : out of this I now pledge my word to pay the £20. 10 and the difference as to time is not much between us. For, dating the 14 days from the day in which your letter was delivered, the day as fixed by you would fall on the 24th of March. And the day proposed by myself would most probably fall on the 3rd of April ; though I have assumed the whole first week of April in order to allow for accidents.

Another sum of Twenty Pounds I pledge my word at the same time to pay during the first week of May. And whatever trifle would remain after that I will pay before leaving the house.

With respect to your proposal—that we should give up the premises on the 15th of May instead of the 25th, and receive in return an allowance of one month's rent (*i.e.* £9)—I beg to say that, as to the *time*, we will willingly anticipate our removal by as many days as you wish ; or more, if more are requisite. Indeed, if *that* would at all forward any purpose connected with lady Nairne's interest, we could remove on the 8th. As to the allowance however for this premature removal, I *had* intended to take exactly what you yourselves offered ; judging that it might seem morose on my part, or an argument that I retained some hostile remembrance of your early proceedings against me if I should stand upon punctilios in a trifle. Whereas, though satisfied that you had caused me much embarrassment and trouble without adding one iota to lady Nairne's real security, I had long since dismissed such a feeling under the conviction that you had acted entirely upon your own very peculiar view of your duty. I retain that conviction. But still I am warned by your abrupt recurrence to a system of menaces, so perfectly uncalled for, that I ought not to accept the merest trifle beyond my strict due. And therefore I will take the exact allowance, rateably determined, for the number of days which your agents may report to you as convenient for the purposes before them.

I remain, Gentlemen,
Your obedient humble Servant,
THOMAS DE QUINCEY.

II

The second letter tells of the rapidly declining health of De Quincey's son, of whom Mr. Japp, relates : "Then his oldest son, William, a brilliant and beautiful youth, not eighteen, 'whose scholarship and eagerness for learning,' says Mrs. Baird Smith, 'astonished even my father, who was his sole tutor,' passed away in 1835 from a painful and obscure disease of the brain,"¹ and of whom De Quincey writes in his *Letters from a Modern Author to his Daughters on the Useful Limits of Literature considered as a Study for Females* : "Your eldest brother, my first-born child, the crown and glory of my life, died nearly upon his eighteenth

¹ Japp, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

birthday. Upon him I had exhausted all that care and hourly companionship could do for the culture of an intellect, in all stages of his life, somewhat premature. And the result was such, so far beyond what I had even hoped for, that I was advised (and at one time I entertained the advice) to publish a little memorial account of him and his accomplishments."¹

MY DEAR SIR,

Listen for a moment—and then judge what it was possible for me to have done. When I last saw you, I was anxious certainly for my poor son's life ; but on the whole both I and his mother were daily gathering a little hope in spite of the *very* gloomy tone held by the medical men. He did not grow worse, or not perceptibly worse ; and as time slipped on we trusted that a sufficient range of action would thus have been secured to the medicines employed for establishing new and healthier tendencies. And this hope we have not even yet altogether abandoned. Nevertheless 3 separate causes have since then reduced me to the very lowest state of physical dejection : 1st I have been obliged watch (*sic*) through every night but one since the day on which I last saw you : servants, on various accounts, are not available in such a case ; children are too deeply overpowered by sleep ; and W's poor mother, besides that she has for full 3 weeks past been struggling with the fiercest despair, is absolutely exhausted by her inseparable attendance upon W. from morning to late night [this for the last 5 weeks] as well as by her nightly occupation with a sick infant—which is the sole interruption that she would allow to call her off from her son's bed-side : hence it happens that I only am disposable for this service ; and throughout the last week I have been so worn out by broken rest [to say nothing of agitation and harassing thoughts] as rarely to find myself in the day-time more than half awake—2^{ndly} On Tuesday there was a consultation here on the case ; and the result was—to sink our hopes still further, so far as we allow them to be influenced by what we *hear* from medical men rather than from what we *see* : the case is still pronounced to be as dark and as anomalous as ever ; but the encouragement to hope is not on that account at all the less steadily refused. The medical men own themselves completely at a fault about the true nature and grounds of the complaint, but still persist

¹ Japp, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–21 ; in a footnote Mr. Japp points the way to information of which he makes no use—a report of the case “drawn up and published by the learned and very able physician, Dr. Balfour.”

in gloomy views of it's tendency.—Yet 3^{rdly} all this was nothing in it's effects upon my spirits compared with what I am now going to mention :—Gradually over each eye a film of darkness has been spreading, until at length some days since (or, I believe, yesterday in the fullest sense) this poor boy totally blind (*sic*). He had begun with being totally deaf. And to the consummation of my despair I understand that—should he ever recover—both these affections may remain with him for life. Good God !—what a destiny of horror ! Scarcely 18 years of age, just entering the portals as it were of life, and already cut off from all intercourse with his fellow creatures, and immured in endless darkness !—He himself, poor boy ! anticipates this fate—a fate far worse in the eyes of us all than death and for which I see no alleviation.

These things have so harrowed up my heart with grief and agitation—that even to write a note was for some days impossible to me. Doubtless you are right : the art. requires a very different conclusion : and I have repeatedly labored to write one. I am called off this moment, and know not what to say : but could I not see you for a minute or so to-morrow or Monday ?

Pray excuse my hurry ; and believe me ever

Most truly yours,

THO^S. DE QUINCEY.

P.S. If you cannot conveniently call here to-morrow morn^g [*i.e.* from 12 to 5], I will endeavour to call on you. Yet could you not settle the matter by allowing it to stand over for one month ?—Next week I would make a great effort ; and some circumstances, enabling me to take regular rest, will probably make it a successful effort.¹

A father's emotion, of course, plays no part in the account drawn up by Dr. J. H. Balfour, who read his " Case of peculiar Disease of the Skull and Dura Mater " before the Medico-Chirurgical Society on December 3, 1834—a paper which was later published in *The Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal*, xliii (1835), pp. 319–325. The physician first visited William, described as a young gentleman about eighteen years of age, tall, emaciated, large-eyed, pallid, on October 4, 1834, when he learned that his patient had been deaf since August. Of a pensive,

¹ The letter may have been directed to Professor Macvey Napier, who was then bringing out a seventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, to which De Quincey contributed the article on Goethe (Part LVIII, Edinburgh, January 31, 1835)—see J. A. Green, *De Quincey Bibliography* (Manchester, 1908), p. 11. The letter itself may be conjecturally dated between November 8 and 15, 1834.

studious disposition, "he had always displayed great cleverness and proficiency in his studies, and although, from particular circumstances, he laboured under great disadvantages as to the means of education, still, by his own unaided exertions, he had made considerable progress in ancient and modern languages, as well as in mathematics." On November 8, William totally lost the vision of his right eye and on the 10th or the 11th, that of his left eye; and at half-past nine in the morning of November 25, 1834, he expired. Neither Balfour nor the consulting physician, Sir George Ballingall, seems to have known the cause of the disease. It may be noted that William "had frequently of late resorted to the use of laudanum in considerable doses" for easing pain and procuring sleep. During restless nights, "the recollection of some family distresses seemed to prey upon his mind, and he frequently alluded to them in a very striking manner." Balfour later discovered "that several members of the family have died of *phthisis*, and some have been cut off by head complaints."¹

Mr. Japp's vague date of 1835 for William's death was probably given him by De Quincey's daughters, who naturally desired to conceal their brother's illegitimacy. If William died on November 25, 1834, "nearly upon his eighteenth birthday," he must have been born about December 1, 1816. Mr. Japp says that the marriage between Thomas De Quincey and Margaret Simpson took place at the end of 1816,² but the ceremony may even have been performed in the latter part of the following year, a fact which is suggested by Charles Lamb's note to a letter of his sister's to Dorothy Wordsworth, November 21, 1817: "It is a delicate subject, but is Mr. *** really married? . . . Oh how funny he did talk to me about her, in terms of such mild quiet whispering

¹ Thomas De Quincey himself had been removed from school at the age of fourteen or fifteen "in consequence of a very alarming illness threatening his head." Dr. Gould, however, believes De Quincey's lifelong suffering to have been the result of "reflex ocular neurosis" (George M. Gould, *Biographic Clinics*, I (Philadelphia, 1903), 34.

² Japp, *op. cit.*, p. 144. Miss Simpson would then have been eighteen years old. The following entry in the Parochial Registers, County of Edinburgh, St. Cuthberts, Deaths 1830-1839—Register House, Edinburgh—adds a little to our scanty knowledge of her:

1837	Age
August 7 Mrs Margaret De Quency Spouse of Mr De Quency	39
Place of Death Cause of Death.	
Holyrood Gardens Typhus Fever.	

Mr. Japp says of her demise: "Mrs. de Quincey's health failed rapidly after her son William's death. She died in August 1837, and was buried in the West Kirkyard [also St. Cuthberts], Edinburgh, beside her children." Japp, *op. cit.*, p. 219. I find no record of William's burial (those were not the days of compulsory registration) in any of the Edinburgh mortality lists available in the Register House; neither is his name mentioned on the stone erected to the memory of his father and mother (*Monumental Inscriptions in St. Cuthbert's Churchyard, Edinburgh*, compiled by John Smith and edited by Sir James Balfour Paul (Edinburgh, 1915), p. 78).

speculative profligacy."¹ Whatever the exact date may have been, De Quincey had definitely furnished grist to the scandal mill, whose wheel was turning as late as 1852 when John Gibson Lockhart wrote to the Rev. Whitwell Elwin, his successor as editor of the *Quarterly Review*, in his most bitterly snobbish vein :

20. Octr. 1852

My DEAR SIR

I will give you a few bits of De Quincey's history as preparatory for study of his books. His father was a Bristol man in good business & the son went to Oxford w a view to the church ; but after undergoing part of the Examination for B.A. in a very promising style, he lost heart, bolted that night, next morning was not to be found. He by this first escapade much displeased his father, who dying soon after, I believe before the youth had been heard of, left *all* to his wife. She by & bye found Thomas out, if he had been hitherto undiscovered, & made him an allowance of handsome amount whereon he prefixed *De* to the paternal *Quincey*, & announced himself as representative of the great old Earls of Winchester among the people of the Lake Country where he had estab^d himself as lodger in the house of a worthy old *statesman*,² a neighbour of Wordsworths. This good little yeoman had a very handsome daughter—very tall—& De Q. though not above 5 feet high, w a head twice too big & almost no legs, made a conquest of her. In short she was *enceinte* & W. W. & his womankind aided the parents to their best to get a marriage accomplished but the hero w^d not—he again bolted. However, *after* a son was born, he did return & married the girl & they lived together for some years quietly on Grasmere & had some other children. But the opium system, adopted I suppose, from Coleridge, then in Lakeland, by degrees ruined the man soul body & estate, & he led for years an uncertain wandering life, often *here*, often in Edn^r,—his chief friend I think being Wilson who had bought a pretty little Estate on Windermere merely to be near W. W. I first met De Q. when on one of his excursions to Edin^r perhaps 30 years ago & then, when sober, he was a very interesting companion—a good scholar

¹ *The Letters of Charles Lamb*, The Bibliophile Society (Boston, 1905), iv, 102. Mary's only comment is : " I am very sorry for Mr. De Quincey ; what a blunder the poor man made when he took up his dwelling among the mountains ! "

² A *statesman*, which means in Cumberland phrase one who owns the fee-simple of his land, but works on it himself (*New English Dictionary*, s.v. *statesman*).

& a sharp critic—arrogant enough already & pompous but not at all so absurdly as afterwards. He usually however was drunk dead drunk at an Early hour—for he drank all he cd get & between glasses kept munching opium pills out of a snuffbox as another man might munch filberts.¹ I soon dropt him as unfit for a decent house with ladies about it ; I have hardly seen him for very many years : but I know that most of his middle-life has been a series of miseries & degradations—jails included. I am told he has now in great measure reformed—he must be upwards of 70—& is in tolerable circumstances & taken care of by some daughters who, wonderful to say, have turned out most respectably. They live in a village near Edin—but I fancy Wilson & he have had scarce any intercourse for many years They have besides their common feelings as to W. W. the same love of predominating & so each has I fancy lived mostly w a little circle of juniors, in all respects inferior. Probably De Q.'s garrulous selflove will have told enough to fill up my outline

Yours

JGL ²

In a spirit similar to Lockhart's, Crabb Robinson also penned a moral arraignment of De Quincey, dated June 11, 1812,³ but actually written between 1849 and 1853 : " While residing here [near Grasmere] De Qu. became connected with the daughter of a Statesman, a small freeholder—so they are called in the Northern Counties.—It was not till after he had

¹ Cf. Lockhart to Jonathan H. Christie, postmarked November 29, 1815 : " I dined the other day at his [Sir William Hamilton's] house in company with two violent Lakers—Wilson for one, and a friend of his, a most strange creature, for the other. His name is De Quincey ; he was of Worcester. After passing one half of an examination which has never, according to the common report, been equalled, he took the terror of the schools, and fled for it to the Lakes. There he has formed the closest intimacy with Wordsworth and all his worthies. After dinner he set down two snuff-boxes on the table ; one, I soon observed, contained opium pills—of these he swallowed one every now and then, while we drank our half-bottle apiece." Andrew Lang, *The Life and Letters of John Gibson Lockhart* (London, 1897), i, 97-98. James Hogg, editor of *Hogg's Instructor*, says of De Quincey at a much later period : " After taking one or two opium-pills, in a short time he would become 'lively as a cricket.'" (Japp, *op. cit.*, p. 334.) Charles MacFarlane (1799-1858) reports : " When invited out, he carried his laudanum bottle with him to dinner-table and to supper-table."—See MacFarlane, *Reminiscences of a Literary Life* (London, 1917), pp. 78-83.

² *Letters* (15) of J. G. Lockhart to the Rev. Whitwell Elwin, 1850-54 (National Library of Scotland, MS. 145). It need hardly be said that Lockhart's summary contains many errors ; the elder De Quincey, for instance, was a Manchester merchant who died in his thirty-ninth year while Thomas was yet a child of seven.

³ Apparently the day on which Robinson first met De Quincey. See *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson*, ed. Thomas Sadler, 3rd ed. (London and New York, 1872), i, 204.

had several children by her, & that to the knowledge of the whole neighbourhood, that he married her. When this marriage took place he expected that Mrs. Wordsworth & the other ladies of W.'s house would visit her. This they declined doing & in consequence De Quincey's friendship turned to gall & from being the enthusiastic follower, he became the enemy of W., depreciating his works & in his writings, where he could not but praise the poet, he reviled the man."¹

III

The last De Quincey letter in the Watson Collection was addressed to [J. H.] Burton, Esq., Advocate, [9] Wariston Crescent, during the opium-eater's fourth year within the boundaries of Holyrood—a debtor's sanctuary which is described by Lockhart in *Peter's Letters to his Kinsfolk* (1819):

I forgot to mention the only inhabitants of this Palace, or rather of its precincts, are gentlemen, who find it convenient to take advantage of the sanctuary still afforded by the royalty of the soil. All around the Palace itself, and its most melancholy garden, there are a variety of little miserable patchwork dwellings, inhabited by a considerable population of gentry, who prefer a residence here to one in a jail. They have abundance of room here within their limits, for the whole of Arthur's Seat is, I believe, considered as part of the royal domain. However, they emerge into the town of a Sunday; and I am told some of them contrive to cut a very fashionable figure in the streets, while the catch-poles, in obedience to the commandment, "rest from working."²

To a man of De Quincey's literary habits, the awkwardness of obtaining books must have been one of the worst features of this enforcedly restricted life.³

Miss Miller's Lodgings
Holyrood Gardens, Abbey
Friday Morn^g Jan. 19, 1839

MY DEAR SIR,

You were so kind as to offer your aid in borrowing a few books for me. It will not make you less willing to do me this kindness—if I say [as I can most truly], that, with a view to my

¹ Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Lamb, etc., selected from the remains of Henry Crabb Robinson and edited by Edith J. Morley (Manchester, 1922), p. 58; see also p. 67, and *The Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson with the Wordsworth Circle* (1808-1866), ed. Edith J. Morley (Oxford University Press, 1927), p. 90, in which Lamb is mentioned as an informant. A much kinder rumour is recorded by Sumner in his letter to George S. Hillard of January 23, 1839 (Edward L. Pierce, *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner* (Boston, 1893), ii, 45-46).

² Postscript to Letter III.

³ For De Quincey's library of earlier and more prosperous days, see *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, ed. William Knight (Boston and London, 1907), i, 481, and Japp, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

extrication from severe difficulties, which have recently assumed a more persecuting form than ever [but for all that are rapidly drawing to a close], these particular books will do me a most essential service : Be not afraid of my giving you any trouble by needless detention of the books : my habits in that point, and in all other forms of procrastination are as much altered as my state of health. The Books are

1. *A Life of Schiller* : Either Carlisle's or a German Life : any Life in short.

2. [For a separate article] "The Polit. Economy" of Malthus : Elements or Principles or something is the full tit., I think : 1 vol. 8^{vo}

3. [For a third art. at a future time] any edit. of Swift's Works. Of course, as fullest on acct. of the Life, I should prefer Sir W. Scott's. But—"beggars must not be choosers"—says the Prov.^b 1

Excuse my paper :—I have used up all the envelopes of my enemies' letters : and my friends are not such "productive laborers" in letter-writing at this time. Excuse also my hurry. Would that I might also use my enemies' time. Ever believe me, my dear Sir,

Your faithful Servant,

T. DE QUINCEY.

¹ De Quincey contributed an article on Schiller to the seventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, in which he remarks, as does Carlyle, on the near coincidence of Schiller's birth with that of Burns. De Quincey mentions Scott's *Life of Swift* in his criticism of F. C. Schlosser's *Literary History of the Eighteenth Century* (*Tait's Magazine*, September and October, 1847).

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

A NOTE ON THE UNITY OF AUTHORSHIP OF WYNNERE AND WASTOURE AND THE PARLEMENT OF THE THRE AGES

THE problem of the unity of authorship of *Wynnere & Wastoure* and *The Parlement of the Thre Ages* is of more than ordinary interest, for upon our solution of it will finally depend our understanding of the inter-relationship of Middle English alliterative poems generally. *Wynnere & Wastoure* can be dated with certainty as belonging to the years 1352-53. It is true that Professor Hulbert¹ has argued forcibly for the date 1351-1366, but he has since, we are given to understand, expressed his agreement with Dr. J. R. Steadman's conclusions, that 1352-53 will alone explain the topical allusions.² Professor Hulbert rejects the unity of authorship of the companion poems on general grounds, and Dr. Steadman³ has followed up certain suggested lines of inquiry with similar results. His main point is that there are "differences in rhetoric, syntax and vocabulary." Under the last heading much stress is laid upon "the choice of synonyms" in the two poems. *Angrye* in *Parl.* corresponds to *wod(e)* and *wrothe* in *Wyn.*: *horse*, *kaple*, *stede*, *blonke* in *Parl.* to *horse* and *capill* in *Wyn.*: *speke*, *say*, *tell*, *declare* in *Parl.* to *speke*, *say*, *tell*, *quod*, *melleste* in *Wyn.*: *katur* in *Parl.* to *foure* in *Wyn.*

This method is at first sight fascinating, especially when extended over a wider field of vocabulary, and judging from the title of his article, Dr. Steadman evidently thinks that along with his tests of rhetoric and syntax it offers great possibilities. The purpose of this note is to show that the difficulties involved in such a test are most serious. The simplest line of attack is so obvious that it seems

¹ "The Problem of the Authorship and Date of *Wynnere & Wastoure*," *Modern Philology*, vol. 18, pp. 31-40, 1920.

² "The Date of *Wynnere & Wastoure*," *Modern Philology*, vol. 19, pp. 211-19, 1922.

³ "The Authorship of *Wynnere & Wastoure* and *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*: a Study in Methods of determining the Common Authorship of Middle English Poems," *Modern Philology*, vol. 21, pp. 7-14, 1923.

hardly necessary to mention it; the list of words used as evidence must be read in the light of their context. We then discover that *wod(e)* (*Wyn.* 373, 465) means "mad," not "angry," that *wrothe* (*Wyn.* 201) and *angrye* (*Parl.* 163) are alike required for the alliteration.

E.g. *Envyous and angrye, and Elde was his name* (*Parl.* 163). *Elde* is the essential word in the line, and vocalic alliteration was required; hence the poet uses *angrye* rather than *wrothe*.

Similarly *stede* (*Parl.* 190, 272) and *blonke* (*Parl.* 110) were needed for the alliteration. The words for "say" are identical in both poems except for *Ecclesiastes the clerke declares in his boke* (*Parl.* 638); *Thou melleste of a mater . . .* (*Wyn.* 264), which is a stock phrase. *Declare* and *melleste* were the most natural words to use. In addition, *quod* is found in *Wyn.* 246, etc., a poem in which there is much conversation, while in *Parl.* there is little. Dr. Steadman might have taken the numerous synonyms for "man" and "to go" with similar results. *Wyn.* 122 has *trynes*, used in a stock phrase, whereas the word does not occur in *Parl.*; *bowes*, *bewes*, is found in *Parl.* in alliteration, but not in *Wyn.* Both *Wyn.* and *Parl.* use *burne*, *freke*, *gome*, *hapel*, *knight*, *lede*, *man*, *renk*, *wyze*; *Parl.* has also *tulk* and *segge* (both in alliteration), and *Wyn.* has *schalk* (twice, both in alliteration). On the basis of such a study, it is manifestly impossible to argue that there is here any real evidence for or against the unity of authorship. Alliterative verse required numerous synonyms to meet the needs of the metre. While the method might apply in a study of prose texts, it cannot be applied to alliterative verse. No one would seriously argue that the words *blonke*, *stede*, and *declare* were unknown to the author of *Wyn.*; they did not happen to be needed for the alliteration in any particular line.

The weakness of this method becomes more apparent when we turn to *Patience* and *Cleanness*, two works which are undoubtedly by the same author. There we find that *speke* is used in *Cl.*, but not in *Pat.*; that *deme* in the sense of "utter" is found in *Pat.* 119, but not in *Cl.* in that sense. Of the words for "to go" *cayre* is found in *Cl.*, but not in *Pat.*; *strece* "go" (*Cl.* 905) does not occur in *Pat.*; *boze* is found in *Cl.* in the sense of "go," but not in *Pat.* in that sense. Other examples might be given, but no one would on the basis of such facts proceed to overthrow the theory of the common authorship of *Patience* and *Cleanness*.

Dr. Steadman further mentions that the author of *Wyn.* is fonder of compound words than is the author of *Parl.*, because *Wyn.* has thirty-two such words, whereas *Parl.* has but seventeen. Can any conclusion, however, be drawn from such statistics? He then gives us a short list of words found only in *Wyn.*, and a longer list of words found only in *Parl.* The words in the shorter list represent in general ideas not found in *Parl.*, such as *wod(e)*, meaning "mad," as the context shows. The same is largely true of the longer list in *Parl.*, a poem which naturally called for a wider range of vocabulary than did *Wyn.* Hence *drepe* (3) in *Parl.*, whereas the idea of "slay" does not seem to have been used in *Wyn.* In almost every case the words in the longer list are used for the alliteration.

The less important points of rhetoric and syntax are somewhat vague, and amount to very little. Difference in subject may require different style and different vocabulary, as Dr. Steadman himself admits, and an interval of years (*Parl.* is undated) may work havoc with a poet's "rhetoric, syntax and vocabulary." The purpose of this note is not to adduce further evidence in favour of the unity of authorship of the two poems (Sir Israel Gollancz has stated the points so clearly¹), but to show that this new method of determining the common authorship of Middle English poems has certain inherent dangers.

J. P. OAKDEN.

THE ITALIAN SOURCE FOR RAVENSCROFT'S *ITALIAN HUSBAND*

The Italian Husband, Edward Ravenscroft's last play, was produced at the theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1697. As it appeared too late to come under the eye of the omniscient Gerard Langbaine,² no source for it seems to have been mentioned until *Biographia Dramatica* printed the following:

The plot of this drama is taken from the history of Castruccio and Gloriana, in a collection of stories, entitled, *The Glory of God's Revenge against the bloody and detestable Sins of Murther and Adultery, express'd in Thirty modern tragical Histories*, by Thomas Wright, M.A., of St. Peter's College, in Cambridge. 8vo. 1685.³

¹ See J. P. Oakden's *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English*, pp. 55 and 249, for the dialectal and metrical evidence.

² Author of *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, Oxford, 1691.

³ ii, 337.

This information has been repeated by Hazlitt,¹ by Ward,² and by Bartholomew.³ So far as I have found, no one else writing in English about Ravenscroft's tragedy has gone more deeply into the question, and Wright's story has stood as the original for the plot of *The Italian Husband*.

Although a comparison of the two works reveals a general similarity of idea, the actual resemblance between them is not close; and the possibility that Ravenscroft made use of *The Glory of God's Revenge* is diminished in view of the likeness of his play to an Italian tragedy, hitherto unmentioned by English or American scholars, in this connection.

While looking through Robert Prölss's *Geschichte des Neueren Dramas*,⁴ my attention was arrested by the following:

Edward Ravenscroft . . . hier sei nur noch einer anderen Adaption desselben, *The Italian husband* (1697), gedacht, weil ihr dasselbe Stück zu Grunde liegt, welches wir beim italienischen Theater aus Cicognini's *Il tradimento per l'onore* kennen lernten."

This somewhat ambiguous statement of Prölss might lead one to believe that, in his discussion of *Il Tradimento per l'Honore*,⁵ he had spoken of another play which would prove to be the source for *The Italian Husband*. Since he has not even mentioned another piece in that section of his work,⁶ I infer that what he intended to say was that *Il Tradimento* is the original of Ravenscroft's tragedy.

A comparison of the two works confirms this belief. The Englishman has taken most of the names of his characters from Cicognini's drama, as the following lists will show:

Il Tradimento

Federico Duca di Poplei.
Alouisia sua Moglie.
Alfonso Marchese di Radiano.
Fidalbo suo Secretario.
Rodrigo Cameriere di Federico.

Armidea }
Pasaula } Damigelle d'Alouisia.

The Italian Husband

Frederico, Duke of Radiano.
Alouisia, Duchess.
Alfonso, Marquis of Rosse.
Fidalbo, Secretary to the Duke.
Rodrigo, Gentleman of the Chamber.

Amidea }
Florella } Women to the Duchess.

¹ *A Manual for the Collector of Old English Plays*, p. 118.

² *D.N.B.*, xlvii, 317.

³ *C.H.E.L.* viii, 194.

⁴ Leipzig, 1881, vol. ii, pt. 2, p. 273.

⁵ By Giacinto Andrea Cicognini, Roma, 1664.

⁶ *Geschichte des Neueren Dramas*, i, 663-66.

The two plots are identical even to details. In each Alouisia meets her former lover, the Marquis Alfonso, for the first time since her marriage, and at once succumbs to him. In each her guilt is betrayed to her husband by Rodrigo, whose love for Alouisia has been scorned. In both plays the duke slays Rodrigo for his meddlingness, but postpones the punishment of the adulterous pair. Cicognini and Ravenscroft have the duke save Alfonso from ruffians, thus making the marquis believe in the former's forgiveness. In both dramas Alfonso accepts the duke's invitation to a feast, at which the guest is served with a plate in which is a picture of the duchess, while in the host's plate is a dagger. Alfonso is slain. In *Il Tradimento* and *The Italian Husband* the retribution of the duchess is reserved for the end. In each Alouisia, ignorant of Alfonso's death, repents her affair with him, and awaits the final proof of the duke's reconciliation to her. In each she is led by her husband to the bed on which is the body of the murdered Alfonso, and is then slain by the duke.

Ravenscroft has omitted from his tragedy some unimportant scenes which occur between minor characters in *Il Tradimento*. He has also reduced much of Cicognini's dialogue, thus making *The Italian Husband* a very brief three-act drama. The play fills up enough time for an evening's performance, however, for he has introduced some musical interludes such as the entertainment in Act I, supposed to be given in honour of the wedding anniversary of the duke and duchess, and the masque of *Ixion*,¹ which is given at the feast for Alfonso at the beginning of Act III.

Although shortening the dialogue of the original, Ravenscroft has, as was usual with him, paraphrased rather closely, as the succeeding selections will indicate :

From *Il Tradimento*, I, iv.

Rod. O Misero, & infelice Rodrigo, già che l'altrui amorose contentezze à te sono veri preludij di morte. O Alouisia, ò Duchessa, quanto, ò quanto mi costa la tua suprema bellezza, a prezzo del cuore io l'hò veduta, e pagherei per il possesso d'essa il prezzo d'una schiavitùdine eterna. Già sono avvezzo à tormenti d'inferno. Fuss 'io pur fatto eletto di poter rallegrarmi un Sol momento nel Giardino del suo seno, poi per castigo della mia temerità, fosse dannata l'anima mia all'abissso d'eterna privazione, . . .

¹ Hazlitt, in *A Manual for the Collector and Amateur of Old English Plays*, p. 118, says that "Mears attributes it [*Ixion*] to W. Taverneur."

From *The Italian Husband*, p. 8.

Rod. Miserable unhappy Rodrigo,
Whose Love must be the Prologue to his Death :
Ah Duchess, how does this Heaven of Beauty
Plunge and torment me in a Hell of pain.
Oh that I might but snatch one Flower
From the fair Garden of thy fragrant bosom,
I'd quit my hopes of Paradise.

From *Il Tradimento*, iii, ix.

Aloi. Sig. Duca.
Duc. Sig. Duchessa.
Aloi. Amato Consorte.
Duc. Cara sposa.
Aloi. Eccomi.
Duc. Vi attendevo.
Aloi. Vi veggo torbido.
Duc. Hò passione al cuore.
Aloi. Che vi tormenta ?
Duc. Ho notata passione.
Aloi. Poso 'io rimediarvi.
Duc. Anzi solo lei da questa può
 guarirmi.
Aloi. Ecco la vita se bisogna.
Duc. Generosa liberalità.
Aloi. Mi sarebbe caro spendarla per
 voi.
Duc. Parlate sincera.
Aloi. Col cor nella lingua.
Duc. Morireste per mia cagione.
Aloi. Ben volentieri.

From *The Italian Husband*, p. 38.

Dutchess. O, my Lord !
Duke. My Dutchess !
Dutch. My dear lov'd Lord !
Duke. My once dear Wife.
Dutch. Once ! my Lord ?
Duke. Yes Alouisia—But I had
 forgot.
Dutch. You seem troubled—
Duke. My mind is burden'd.
Dutch. Can I ease you ?
Duke. You only—
Dutch. With my life, if needful.
Duke. Speak sincerely—
Dutch. My tongue and heart are
 partners in this truth.
Duke. Wou'd you dye for me ?
Dutch. Most willingly.

Added to the preceding evidence that the source for *The Italian Husband* was Cicognini's *Il Tradimento per L'Honore* is Ravenscroft's assertion in the words of the poet in the Prælude that "I have writ in the stile of the Italian tragedies." No longer, then, is it necessary to consider Thomas Wright's *The Glory of God's Revenge* in connection with Ravenscroft's drama. Wright's story, however, was unquestionably the basis for another play, called *The Italian Husband : or, The Violated Bed Avenged*,¹ a work which bears no relationship to Ravenscroft or Cicognini. With the exception of Pröls's above quoted somewhat cryptic statement I know of no other mention of Ravenscroft's debt to *Il Tradimento*.

EDWARD T. NORRIS.

¹ By Edward Lewis. Printed in 1754, but never acted.

THE TEMPLE OF DULLNESS AND OTHER INTERLUDES

The Temple of Dullness. With the Humours of Signor Capochio, and Signora Dorinna. A Comic Opera of Two Acts. As it is Perform'd at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane. The Music by Mr. Arne (1745), with the interludes related to it, should have a modest place in any account of eighteenth-century satire upon Italian opera. Especially interesting is the question of authorship, which involves the relation of *The Temple of Dullness* to a preceding and a following sketch. Then, the satire itself is not lacking in point and significance. The three interludes in question present a curious problem, which invites solution.

As regards authorship, opinion is at present uncertain. The *Biographia Dramatica*; or, *A Companion to the Playhouse* remarks, "We have also heard attributed to Cibber *The Temple of Dullness*,"¹ and lists as "probably an abridgment of this last" *Capochio and Dorinna*, which *The Drama Recorded*; or, *Barker's List of Plays, Alphabetically Arranged* assigns to Colley Cibber.² The *Dictionary of National Biography* merely repeats these statements.³ These interludes are not discussed by Mr. Allardyce Nicoll,⁴ or in the recent studies of Colley Cibber.⁵ However, in J. P. Kemble's copy of the first edition of *The Temple of Dullness*, now in the Huntington Library, there is on the title-page in his hand a note that offers a valuable clue. Kemble wrote, "This Piece has very injuriously been set down to the account of Colley Cibber; whereas it is only the burlesque part of *The Happy Captive* by L. Theobald. 8vo, 1741, with some additions." Comparison of *The Temple of Dullness* with the Interlude in Theobald's *The Happy Captive, An English Opera. With an Interlude, In Two Scenes, Betwixt Signor Capoccio, A Director from the Canary Islands; and Signora Dorinna, A Virtuosa* (1741) proves that Kemble was right.⁶ The

¹ P. 123.

² P. 22. *The Drama Recorded* marks *The Temple of Dullness*, "Anon."

³ iv, 355.

⁴ *History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama, 1700-1750*.

⁵ F. Dorothy Senior, *The Life and Times of Colley Cibber* (London, 1928); D. M. E. Habbema, *An Appreciation of Colley Cibber, Actor and Dramatist* (Amsterdam, 1928).

⁶ R. F. Jones, *Lewis Theobald, His Contribution to English Scholarship with Some Unpublished Letters* (New York, 1919), p. 29, note 71, quotes incorrectly the title of Theobald's opera, and, apparently not having read it, cites Genest's remark that the interlude has greater merits than the serious part and that the opera was never performed.

Interlude of The Happy Captive, concerning which Theobald wrote, "The Interlude . . . is entirely new to our Climate," is the foundation of *The Temple of Dullness*, the preface of which, however, attempts to conceal this indebtedness by saying that "The characters of Capocchio and Dorinna are a Translation from a favourite Italian Intermezzo, that was written to banter one of their Directors and Singers."¹ The translation, as we shall see, was not done by the author of *The Temple of Dullness*, but apparently by Theobald, of whose interlude the following is a résumé.

At the outset, Dorinna, flustered by the approaching visit of Signor Capoccio, an opera director from the Canary Islands, scolds her chambermaids, and then runs over various cantatas. Presently, Capoccio is introduced and after the exchange of elaborate greetings states his mission: he has come to get together a company for his "pompous Theatre," supported at the public cost, and frankly declares that Dorinna is the "Chief of our Ambition." When Dorinna shrewdly urges that she has numerous offers from other nations, Capoccio agrees to meet her own terms; and he also overcomes her objection that her language would be unknown. The managers, he says, give a "Book to the Parterre," and all that is required is good singing; besides, pit and boxes, laughing and prating and absorbed in their own affairs, generally ignore the performers. Next, Capoccio fervently requests a song; and Dorinna, after the conventional hesitations, and accompanying herself at the spinet, obliges. The director, in his turn, is eager to show a sample of his poetic and musical powers. After voicing in stilted phrases his love for Dorinna, he breaks forth into song; but Dorinna summons her maid, pretends that she has an urgent engagement, and for the time escapes Capoccio's unwelcome demonstration. In scene two, Capoccio breaks in upon Dorinna as she completes her toilet, tries to dispel her fears of boisterous audiences, and asks that she favour him with one short scene of the opera. Dorinna sings her part of Cleopatra who languishes in prison, a melancholy rôle. Capoccio declares that the scene is incomplete without a simile, and from his own opera gives an absurd example of two similes joined in one air. Then the contract with Dorinna is concluded on her own terms, with chocolate, ratifia, a handsome equipage and chair, and so on, thrown in for good measure. The

¹ I have not discovered the Italian intermezzo.

strains of the overture break in at this point, and Dorinna hurries away, leaving Capoccio disconsolate.

This *Interlude*, with the omission of a few lines and a slight rearrangement of parts, occurs almost word for word in *The Temple of Dullness*, which, moreover, as Kemble observed, makes considerable additions. To be precise, the *Interlude* is almost 300 lines in length; *The Temple of Dullness* adds approximately 170 lines. The characters added are the Goddess of Dullness; Faddlini, her Maid; Negligence, her Attendant; Signior Puppibello, an Opera Singer; and Merit. Concerning these, the preface, "by way of Argument," says:

Mr. Pope, in his last *Dunciad*, makes the Goddess of *Dullness* preside over *Italian* Operas, from whence her Character is taken. The Allegory of her being in Love with Merit, but scorn'd and avoided by him, and of his being betray'd by *Negligence* into the Temple of *Dullness*, is obvious. . . . Merit is suppos'd a Gentleman of good Sense and sound Judgment; and being introduc'd, chiefly to give his Opinion of what Musical Performances ought to be, does not speak in Recitative. When the Goddess of *Dullness* finds herself totally slighted and abandon'd by Merit, she is glad to take up with Puppibello, and declares, that, henceforward, she and he will be inseparable.

This is a fair synopsis of the additional plot, which occupies Act I, scene i, and Act II, scene i and part of scene ii.

The tone of the additions is indicated by the following speeches. The first, by Dullness, is addressed to Merit:

The Goddess *Dullness* I, who, for thy Love,
Wou'd gladly clarify my clouded Brain,
And, for a Smile, lose *Immortality*;
But that can never be, while witless Bards
Presume to write, and in their Garrets vile,
Translate *Italian* Operas for Bread.

The second, by Merit and addressed to Dullness, begins with a criticism of Capoccio's ridiculous similes and proceeds to a general condemnation of Italian opera:

If you mean it a Burlesque of the Poetry of an ill-written Opera, I think it a very good one. . . . I cannot find out the Excellence of Walls, and Glooms, and Stones, and Dungeons melting to set a Lady free, nor can I launch out into Raptures at errant Nonsense. Musick I love, equal at least to any Art or Science; but while we in *England* speak a Language equal, in Delicacy, to any, superior in nervous Energy to most, I shall save my Transports for Performances, where Sense and Sound are properly united, or as *Milton* says,

"Where Sound is married to immortal Verse."

Incidentally, it may be noted that Merit knows his Shakespeare as well as his Milton. At the opening of Act II, Merit, seated at a table in his bedchamber, reads from *Troilus and Cressida* the following speech of Ulysses to Achilles on the path to honour :

For Honour travels in a Streight so narrow,
Where one but goes a-breast ; keep then the Path ;
For Emulation hath a thousand Sons,
That one by one pursue ; if you give way,
Or turn aside from the direct Foreright,
Like to an entred Tyde, they all rush by,
And leave you hindermost.¹

In general, the new material in *The Temple of Dullness* develops and reinforces the *Interlude* satire upon the absurdities of Italian opera and particularly the foibles of director and singer. Under the patronage of Dullness and her attendants, this opera, it is urged, can excite only the derision of good judges. Heartily ashamed of his association with stupidity and her hangers-on, the foes of virtue, Merit represents the insular Englishman of tradition, with his worship of common sense, his love of all things English, and his contempt for outlandish forms of art.

According to the *Biographia Dramatica*, the musical entertainment *Capochio and Dorinna* is "probably an abridgment" of *The Temple of Dullness*. The truth is that the abridgment, of which the title is *Capochio and Dorinna, An Interlude for Music of Two Acts Translated from an Italian Intermezzo of That Title. By the Late Colley Cibber, Esq. ; Poet Laureate. The Music Composed by Dr. Arne . . .* (n.d.), follows mainly the *Interlude* in *The Happy Captive* and hardly at all *The Temple of Dullness*.² The introduction to *Capochio and Dorinna* states that to make the entertainment of a suitable length "much of the original recitative is necessarily omitted." Actually, the abridgment has none of the additions in *The Temple of Dullness*. In nearly every case *Capochio and Dorinna* agrees with the *Interlude* ; for example, in both, Capochio is a director in the Canary Islands (whereas in *The Temple of Dullness* the director hails from England) ; in both, Dorinna makes the same excuses for not singing (these are omitted in *The Temple of Dullness*) ; in both, she lays down the same specifications in her contract.

¹ It will be observed that in quoting the author takes some liberties.

² *Capochio and Dorinna* has approximately 150 lines. Thus, it is about one half the length of the *Interlude* and less than one third the length of *The Temple of Dullness*.

Frequently, the words are identical or nearly so, as in the following :

<i>Interlude</i>	<i>Capochio and Dorinna</i>
Dorin. Excuse me, I'm so very hoarse.	Dor. Excuse me ; I'm exceeding hoarse.
Capoc. One Song requires not so great Force.	Cap. To sing pathetic needs no force.
Dorin. Nor is the Instrument in tune.	Dor. Nor is the instrument in tune.

The lines just quoted are not in *The Temple of Dullness*. I may add that the scene of Cleopatra in prison, which occurs in precisely the same words in both early burlesques, is omitted in *Capochio and Dorinna*, which substitutes for this scene Dorinna's air criticising the rude behaviour of audiences, from the second scene of the *Interlude*. It is very curious, on the other hand, that the duet at the end of the abridgment follows almost word for word the duet in *The Temple of Dullness*. Here the *Interlude* is quite different.

Thus, it is obvious that the *Interlude*, not *The Temple of Dullness*, is the main source of *Capochio and Dorinna*. It seems equally clear that Cibber had nothing to do with the latter burlesque, a rather perfunctory production. Whether he was the author of the additions in *The Temple of Dullness* remains undecided. In favour of Cibber is the satire upon Italian opera, for which it is well known he had no liking.¹ In the preface to *Venus and Adonis*, for example, Cibber attacked foreign music, declaring, in part, that "by slavishly giving up our Language to the Despotick Power of Sound only, we are so far from establishing Theatrical Musick in England, that the very Exhibition or Silence of it seems entirely to depend upon the Arrival or Absence of some Eminent Foreign Performer." In the prologue to *Love in a Riddle* he pleads for English song :

If Songs are harmless Revels of the Heart,
Why should our Native Tongue not bear its Part ?

And in the epilogue to this ballad opera he exults in these words :

Poor English Mouths, for twenty Years,
Have been shut up from Musick ;
But, thank our Stars, Outlandish Aires
At last have made all You-sick.

Moreover, in *The Temple of Dullness* the style of the blank verse

¹ See, for example, A. Nicoll, *op. cit.*, pp. 162, 231.

and of several added airs has something in common with that of *Love in a Riddle*; but this test is inconclusive. On the other hand, in the preface the somewhat friendly reference to Pope argues against Cibber's authorship. At any rate, the main conclusion is that in the *Interlude* from *The Happy Captive*, *The Temple of Dullness*, and *Capochio and Dorinna* we have an interesting series of satires upon Italian opera for which Theobald should receive principal credit.

GEORGE W. WHITING.

LADY ANNE BACON'S TRANSLATIONS

LADY ANNE BACON'S English version of Jewel's *Apologia* was first published in 1564, not 1562 as the *S. T. C.* (No. 14590) has it.¹ The anonymous 1562 translation is distinctly another work.² The 1564 version contains a prefatory letter from Archbishop Parker to "Ladie A. B.," naming her as translator.

She also translated fourteen sermons of Bernardino Ochino, first published (1550?) as *Fourtene Sermons*, translated by "A. C.,"³ but the *S. T. C.* (No. 18767) fails to indicate the translator. These are Nos. 12-25 in *Certayne Sermons* (1550?), and Nos. 1-14 in *Sermons of . . . Ochyne* (1570?), editions which contain also six sermons translated by Richard Argentine, first printed by Scoloker at Ipswich in 1548,⁴ and five others, first published anonymously by Reddell in 1548.⁵ The 1570 (?) edition names only "A. C." as translator, and the *S. T. C.* (No. 18768) thus assigns the twenty-five to her, but only twelve in the *Certayne Sermons* of 1550 (?) (No. 18766).⁶ In both cases the fourteen of the first edition were reprinted, and the other sermons were reprints of the two 1548 translations.

RUTH HUGHEY.

¹ M. A. Scott, "Elizabethan Translations from the Italian," *P. M. L. A.*, xiii, 50 (1913), makes this error, and it appears in the Brit. Mus. Catalogue entries.

² Pointed out by Jas. Anderson in *Ladies of the Reformation*, p. 491 (1857). I have examined the three known copies of the 1562 translation.

³ That is, Anne Cooke, Lady Bacon's maiden name.

⁴ Nos. 1-6 (1550?); 15-20 (1570?).

⁵ Nos. 7-11 (1550?); 21-25 (1570?). Two distinct works in 1548, not different editions of the same, as the *S. T. C.* has it (Nos. 18764-18765).

⁶ Error made also in Brit. Mus. Catalogue. M. A. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 45, does not mention the 1570 (?) edition.

REVIEWS

English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century. Edited by CARLETON BROWN. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1932. 8°. Pp. xliii+312. 10s. 6d. net.

THIS, like its predecessor, *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century*, is far more than an anthology. It is a work of research that will be a permanent delight to scholars. Within the compass of a small and handy volume Professor Carleton Brown has gathered a representative and tolerably extensive, if not actually complete, collection of pieces from what may, with but minor qualification, be called the first century of modern lyrical composition in English. He has printed the texts as they stand in the manuscripts with the minimum of editorial interference, he has often given a poem in two, even in three, different forms, and elucidated their texts and relationship with concise and pointed notes into which is packed a world of sense and learning. Many of the pieces are here printed for the first time, not a few from that fascinating manuscript, No. 323 at Trinity College, Cambridge (B. 14. 39), the English contents of which it has long been one of my vague ambitions to print *in extenso*. Many a time I have puzzled over the mysterious *Otide te munio* (No. 14) now lucidly explained.¹ Last, but not least, there is an introduction that not only deals with the lyrical output of the century as a whole, but discusses with great acuteness the genesis of individual collections. One of the most interesting points made is the prevalence of musical accompaniment to lyrics of the thirteenth century in contrast to its rarity in the fourteenth. For all this plenty lovers of English poetry are under a heavy debt to Professor Brown.

The wealth of real poetry here collected is astonishing. We are

¹ It is not quite correct to say of these verses, "Not hitherto printed." They are transcribed in full (though rather inaccurately) in James's catalogue. In the second line of the Latin I cannot read *transeis*: the manuscript has quite clearly *transis*. In l. 1 (English) *sir eode* is probably correct, but the original reads *sire ode*, the final *e* is quite distinctive in form. (Fol. 25th has *sire eode* all right.) In l. 7 I am unable to read *morte*: James read *mente*, which does not seem to fit either. In l. 11 *Scrif* may be what the scribe intended, but he wrote *serif*.

at the very threshold of the modern lyric. The remains of the previous century or two, however interesting, are negligible in extent. Such lyrical verse as is found in Anglo-Saxon is of a totally different kind. The thirteenth-century poets had, of course, Latin and French originals, but one can only stand amazed at the technical ability with which they followed them, often in the handling of the most intricate metrical forms. In a sense, I suppose, thirteenth-century lyric may be an acquired taste: probably it will not please every palate. Much, particularly of the secular verse, might be compared to a fine manzanilla, though the likeness is less marked in the more amorous hymns.¹ Yet even the comparatively luscious "God Ureisun of Ure Lefdi" retains something of the dry lucidity of early fresco. Nowhere is the flavour of the thirteenth century clearer than in the reticence of the quatrain with which Professor Brown opens his collection under the rather fanciful title "Sunset on Calvary":

Nou goth sonne vnder wod—
me reweth, Marie, thi faire rode.
Nou goth sonne vnder tre—
me reweth, Marie, thi sone and the.

Equally characteristic in a different vein is the famous "Sumer is icumen in," while a fuller blood pulses in the no less familiar "Bytuene mersh & aueril":

An hendy hap ichabbe yhent,
ichot from heuene it is me sent—
from alle wymmen mi loue is lent,
& liht on Alyoun.

Among the most perfect are the macaronic poems. Could anything be technically more skilful than the wonderful "One that is so fair and bright," that many of us must have learned to love in Morris's *Old English Miscellany*? One text of this comes from the Trinity manuscript, which also supplies a not unworthy pendent in

Seinte Mari, moder milde,
mater salutaris,
feirest flour of eni felde,
uere nuncuparis,

though this fails of the magic of its companion and is more

¹ I think it is true, and if so it is certainly striking, that in this collection sentiment definitely erotic is found almost exclusively in the religious pieces.

obviously artful. MS. Harley 2253 offers an English-French example :

Mayden moder milde,
oiez cel oreysoun ;
from shome thou me shilde,
e de ly malfeloun.
for loue of thine childe
me menex de tresoun ;
ich wes wod & wilde,
ore su en prisoun.

From the Jesus College manuscript comes another old favourite, Thomas of Hales's " Love Rune " :

A mayde Cristes me bit yorne
that ich hire wurche a luue-ron,

with its delightful surprise :

Hwer is Paris & Heleyne
that weren so bryht & feyre on bleo,
Amadas & Dideyne,
Tristram, Yaeude and alle theo,
Ector with his sharpe meyne,
& Cesar riche of wordes feo ?
Heo beoth i-glyden vt of the reyne
so the schef is of the cleo.

Here too is the intriguing fragment of the " Ballad of Judas " :

Hit wes up-on a scerethorsday that vre louerd aros,
ful milde were the wordes he spec to iudas :

and the " Ballad of the Three Kings " :

Wolle ye iheren of twelte day, wou the present was ibroust
in-to Betlem ther Iesus lay, ther thre kinges him habbet isoust ?

both from the Trinity MS., and the second accompanied by an almost illegible rough draft, suggesting that it was actually composed for its present place as a pendant. While from the Harleian comes the ballad " de Clerico et Puella " :

Weylawey ! whi seist thou so ? mi serewe thou makest newe.
y louede a clerk al par amours, of loue he wes ful trewe,
he nes nout blythe neuere a day bote he me sone seghe ;
ich louede him betere then my lyf—whet bote is hit to leghe ?

And lastly, once again at its driest, Trinity gives us :

Say me, viit in the brom,
teche me wou i sule don
that min hosebonde
me louien wolde.—
Hold thine tunke stille
& hawe al thine wille.

I have said that, in its most characteristic mood, thirteenth-century lyric may not be to every one's taste. But even the few verses that I have been tempted into quoting surely prove that there is much that must appeal to every lover of poetry. Unfortunately there are obstacles between the thirteenth century and the twentieth. A casual reader, picking up the present volume, might possibly complain that parts of it he found hard to understand. But it seems to me that the difficulty lies, as a rule, much less in the language than the spelling. Naturally one would not expect the English of 1200 to be written after the fashion of to-day, but it is undeniable that the spelling of many scribes was irritatingly perverse, not to say grossly incompetent. To have the poems as Professor Carleton Brown has printed them is fascinating to the philologist and the palæographer, and I applaud his conservatism; but if he could bring himself to rewrite all or most of these lyrics in rational spelling and with a somewhat freer use of emendation for the benefit of the unlearned lover of poetry, I believe he would be doing a further service to the study of English literature.

W. W. GREG.

When Rome is Removed into England. Eine politische Prophezeiung des 14. Jahrhunderts. Edited by REINHARD HAFERKORN. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, Heft XIX.) Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1932. Pp. 146.

DR. HAFERKORN'S edition of one of the less-studied Middle English prophecies possesses a double interest; his attempts to interpret it throw light on the aims and methods of mediæval English prophetic writings in general, and his account of the vicissitudes through which this particular work has passed affords an excellent illustration of the fortunes of popular literature between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The prophecy, which he calls "When Rome is removed into England" after the commonest version of the opening line, exists in a number of manuscripts and in varying forms. Dr. Haferkorn distinguishes three main versions of it, differing so much from one another that he has been obliged to produce a critical text of each of the three. Even the earliest version (α) is, he believes, a composite work. Common to both the longer versions (α and β) are some

verses concerned with hostilities between the Scotch and English which make use of symbolism mainly suggested by the prophecies of Merlin in Book VII of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*. These verses are believed by the editor to represent the original form of the prophecy. The sympathy of the writer is with the Scotch, and this, and the fact that the linguistic evidence points to a Northern (probably Scottish) origin, leads Dr. Haferkorn to the conclusion that they were the work of an unknown Scottish writer who had a special interest in the fortunes of the town of Berwick (ll. 68-73 in the α version are addressed to this town). The date 1382, given in the text of the best manuscripts of (α), indicates the earliest period to which the prophecy is known to refer.

This prophecy collected to itself a totally distinct set of prophecies, appearing in α in ll. 1-15, 52-59, 74-76, and here and there in ll. 77-96, and differing from the original prophecy in symbolism and metre as well as in subject matter. These are concerned with ecclesiastical and social troubles and, like the political prophecy, probably refer to events in the second half of the fourteenth century. Dr. Haferkorn thinks that they can hardly have been written in Scotland; he attributes them to an English sympathiser with Wyclif. (The language of many of the manuscripts indicates that the original prophecy must have travelled south and this second prophecy could have become attached to it in the course of its wanderings.)

The subsequent history of the prophecy is very complicated; some of the manuscripts even of the α version show important alterations. In one (MS. Kk. i. 5 in the University Library, Cambridge) sympathy is shown not with the Scotch but with the English; in others the passage giving the date has been altered so that we read in different manuscripts 1387, 1482, or 1535. Though the β version is dated 1480, there is some reason to think that (β) best preserves the original Scottish prophecy. The γ version omits the dating passage altogether and so do most of the other short prophecies which were derived from or influenced by the original fourteenth-century verses, but the date 1642 in one of them indicates that a modified form of them was still being given a contemporary application as late as this.

The Introduction, in which Dr. Haferkorn presents the results of his study of this group of prophecies, errs on the side of diffuseness.

It is not necessary for the reader to be led down all the paths which the researcher is bound to explore ; both the results and the evidence on which they are based could have been conveyed more concisely and with less repetition ; but, in spite of this defect of his book, the writer deserves the thanks of students of mediæval English for the care with which he has disentangled the many threads of his complicated problem.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

The Works of Edmund Spenser. A Variorum Edition. Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD, FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1932. Pp. xii+556. Set of eight volumes, £14 8s. Not sold separately.

THIS new edition of Spenser, of which the first volume has now appeared, "aims to furnish an accurate text of Spenser's poetry and prose and to make accessible in convenient form the fruits of all the significant scholarship and literary criticism which have contributed to the better understanding and appreciation of this major poet." This first volume contains the text of Book I of *The Faerie Queene*, the variorum notes of editors, nine appendices dealing with various topics connected with this portion of the poem, a textual appendix, critical notes on the text, and a bibliography. A handsome volume, exquisitely printed in a type which is a joy to read, conveys the work to us. The idea of this edition of Spenser was conceived by the late Professor Greenlaw, whose much-regretted passing away before the publication of the first volume is yet another sad example of the intervention of death before the fulfilment of a scholar's life-work. The edition is now a memorial to his scholarship, and his co-workers are determined that it shall not suffer through any weakening of his ideals, though to a slight extent one can see that the first volume does suffer from the withdrawal of the guiding hand. We are told that Professor Greenlaw was engaged on the second volume at the time of his death.

The present volume offers the text of the 1596 edition of Book I, departures from it being allowed only where there is strong presumption of error. The Textual Appendix, which is not one of the nine

numbered appendices, discusses the variants of the editions of 1590 and 1596, and of copies of 1596, and is accompanied by a long list illustrating the changes of spelling which occur between the two quarto editions. For this portion of the work, Dr. Heffner and Dr. Strathmann are responsible, and their conclusion, the only sound one, is that though Spenser was himself responsible for a revision of the text in 1596, he was not responsible for haphazard changes of spelling. Nor was any individual editor. The responsibility is that of the 1596 compositor, who was influenced to a certain extent by the copy of 1590 from which he was setting-up. Dr. Heffner and Dr. Strathmann have done this work exceptionally well. A parallel discussion of the changes in punctuation is offered, but Professor Padelford notes that the general subject of punctuation in *The Faerie Queene* will be treated more fully in a subsequent volume.

The nine appendices deal with literary aspects and interests. Some, naturally, offer more discussion than others: some belong to interests no longer discussed as major themes, like that on the propriety of the allegory. I list them, to give some idea of the scope of the work. Appendix I, *The Plan and Conduct of the Faerie Queene*; II, *On the Propriety of the Allegory*; III, *Spenser and Ariosto as Artists*; IV, *The Sources of Book I*; V, *The Moral and Spiritual Allegory*; VI, *The Historical Allegory*; VII, *The Character of Una*; VIII, *The Platonic Element*; IX, *The Muse of the Faerie Queene*. The important ones may easily be picked out. They are those dealing with the plan and conduct of the poems, its sources, the moral and spiritual allegory, and the historical allegory. The last two in the list are the results of special studies. Very valuable indeed is the study of the sources, of which some fourteen are discussed.

It is, as I conceive it, part of the duty of a reviewer of such a work as this to offer some kind of report on the reliability of the work. It is not the most pleasant part of his duty. The prospective purchaser wishes to know if he can rely on his purchase, and if the reviewer produces a string of misprints and errors the work acquires a bad name for a time, no matter how much sympathy he may have had for the difficulties the compiler has experienced. In turn the compiler is apt to be wroth, and even to think that an attack has been made. Most of us would rather not take the risk. But here is a work which should be utterly reliable; it is one

which will remain standard long after these poor comments are forgotten ; and some report is desirable.

Generally accurate it is, but if, as I gather from the brief preface, many hands have helped in the compilation of this work, the careful reader will detect slight differences in the extracts given—differences of method, differences in accuracy, differences in the treatment of early texts. Some of these, for example, will be regularly purged of their capitals or italics ; some retain them ; some shed them at one time, not at another. Smoothing these differences out should be the work of the general editor, and it is possible that the differences in treatment, and the errors, which I note, have escaped final adjustment through Professor Greenlaw's death. The question of reproduction of extracts must have been a serious one, but the simplest method would have been to reproduce the originals exactly, in every case, *except in the case of misprints and errors in the originals*. I will refer to this later. As an illustration of difference of treatment I should like to point out that the quotation from Hughes's edition on p. 315 is given exactly as in the original, its capitals and italics in full array, while that from the same editor on pp. 228–29 is shorn of its typographical graces, except for proper names and personifications. There is no apparent reason for the difference.

But the question of exact reproduction becomes crucial when we consider the advisability of reprinting the quotations made by eighteenth-century editors from Chaucer and the classics. Our modern editions are not the same as theirs, and it is hardly worth while perpetuating the inferior texts of the eighteenth century. The Chaucerian world, for example, has moved on, or moved back, since Warton was satisfied with this (p. 180) :

The builder oake, and eek the hardie asshe,
The pillar elme, the coffir unto caraine,
The boxe pipe-tree, holme unto whips lasshe, etc.

It does not concern the editor of Spenser what text of Chaucer was read by an eighteenth-century commentator for the purpose of drawing parallels. What is of primary concern is the text of Chaucer which Spenser read, and next the text of Chaucer we read. If quotations, which are not the original work of the commentator, had to be given, in place of references, I think it would have been advisable to give them from modern texts, within square brackets. To have done this consistently throughout the older English texts, where the modern differs from the eighteenth century, and for the

classical texts, for these also differ, would have made this edition unimpeachable for immediate quotation and reference. I excepted the case of misprints and errors in the originals. I fear I must insist that the complete elimination of these would have been of value. Only on one occasion have I noticed it done, when Todd's misprint in his note on *Faerie Queene*, I, x, xl, 8, on p. 131 of the third volume of his edition, *Descensus ad inferos*, is corrected by the editors. But is the correction correct?

I must here make quite clear that I have not collated the whole of the volume. I have collated the text of the poem, and about half of the extracts given in the commentary and the appendices. I divide the errors, misprints, or other objections, into sections.

1. *Variant readings* (pp. 527-43).

The attempt here has been to be selective, following certain principles explained at the beginning. I have not examined all the variants, only 1596 [b], 1609 [c], Hughes 1715 [H₁], Grosart [G], Dodge [D], and Smith 1909-10 [S]. Errors are few, but I note that there seems to have been some confusion over the two editions of Hughes in 1715 and 1750. For these the symbols H₁ and H₂ are used. Although it is not so stated, simple H appears to stand for both these editions:

- p. 531, Canto III, i, 4 : Through] By *cdEH* [*My H₁ reads Through*]
 p. 535, VI, xxx, 9 : lore] love *H* [*H reads Lore*]
 p. 535, VI, xxxviii, 2 : shall I] I shall *dEHC* [*H₁ reads shall I*]
 p. 535, VII, xii, 3 : him did] did him *H* [*H₁ reads him did*]
 p. 536, VII, xxxv, 1 : No Magicke] Ne magicks *dE* Ne Magick *H* [*H₁ reads No magick*]
 p. 537, VIII, v, 6 : bowre] bowers *H* [*H₁ reads Bower*]
 p. 538, VIII, xxxiii, 1 : asked] added *H* [*H₁ reads asked*]
 p. 538, VIII, xliii, 7 : whom] when *H* [*H₁ reads whom*]
 p. 538, IX, Arg. 1 : loues] love *H* [*H₁ reads Loves*]
 p. 540, X, xxvii, 5 : embay,] embay *dEH* [etc.] [*H₁ reads embay,*]
 p. 540, X, liii, 1 : him] then *H* [*H₁ reads them*]
 p. 541, XI, xiii, 2 : enraunged] enraged *H* [*H₁ reads enraged*]
 p. 541, XI, xxiii, 1 : His] The *H* [*H₁ reads His*]

In the above the notation has obviously been a source of confusion, and the correction of *H* to *H₂* should be made. I have not, however, checked any of the readings of *H₂*. In the third from the bottom it is probable that the reading *then* for *them* is a misprint.

I have not found any errors from 1596, but from 1609 there are four. 1609 is styled *c*; *d* represents 1611.

- p. 537, VIII, vii, 9: beare.] beare: *cd*. [*My copy of 1609 reads beare.*]
 p. 537, VIII, ix, 9: clay.] clay: *cd*. [*My copy of 1609 reads clay.*]
 p. 540, X, xvi, 8: sore,] sore: *cdC*. [*My copy of 1609 reads sore,*]
 p. 542, XI, xxxviii, 4: desire,] desire *cd*. [*My copy of 1609 reads desire:*
Probably the editors have misprinted desire for desire:]
 p. 543, XII, xli, 3: It should have been stated that the variant *ne*
 nor refers only to the second *ne* in the line.

To these I may add the following.

- p. 533, V, xxiii, 9: forlorne ?] forlorne *aS* [*S reads forlorne.*]
 p. 535, VI: for x. 3. [below xliii. 2] read xliii. 3. and for other] other read
 other,] other
 p. 535, VI, xxxviii, 8: thirsted] thirsted *cdEHS* [*S reads thirsted*]
 p. 536: for VII. xlviii. 9. [below xliii. 5] read xliii. 9.
 p. 537: for VIII. xiv. 3 read xiv. 4.
 p. 538: for VIII. xxxi. 5 read xxxi. 4.
 p. 539, IX, xxxi, 5: mealt'h] mealt'h *dEGHS* [*G reads mealt'h*]
 p. 539, X, vi, 1: begin,] begin: *cd* [etc.] [*D reads begin ;*]
 p. 539, X, vi, 6: became,] became; *cd* became: *HCUT* [etc.] [*D reads*
became ;]
 p. 540, X, xvi, 8: for her] he read her] be
 p. 541, XI, xi, 4: . . . (*S reads slacke. in 1590*). This note is incorrect.
 Smith's note (p. 142) is "slack. 1590. . . ."

2. Misprints in Classical quotations.

- p. 179: for *Oedipus* 566-575 read 532-541.
 p. 182: for *Theogony* 5. 301 read 301.
 p. 192: for *Eclogues* 1. 54-6 read 1. 53-5.
 p. 221: for *Met.* 2. 760 [765] ff. read 2. 760 [768] ff.
 p. 234: for *Odes.* 3. 2. read 3. 11. 26.
 p. 235: for *Aen.* 6. 617-19 read 6. 616-8.
 p. 236: for *Aen.* 8. 767: "turbati equi," *Met.* 15. 517: "Turbantur
 equi," and *Fasti* 739: "Turbantur quadrupedes." read *Aen.* 7. 767:
 "turbatis equis," *Met.* 15. 517: "Turbantur quadrupedes," and
Fasti 739 [11. 12]: "premuntur equi."
 p. 237: for *Fasti* 6. 745 read 6. 743.
 p. 237: for *Aen.* 7. 769 read 7. 765.
 p. 237: for *Ovid* (*Met.* 2. 9) read (*Met.* 2. 629).
 p. 238: for *Tristia* 3. 42 read 3. 7. 42.
 p. 250: for *Theb.* 9. 435 read 9. 437.
 p. 253: for *Theb.* 6. 65-6 read 6. 665-7.
 p. 259: for *Aen.* 19. 441 read 9. 441.
 p. 278: for *Aen.* 4. 460 read 4. 462.
 p. 304: for *Aen.* 3. 5716-7 read 3. 571-7.
 p. 306: for *Met.* 8. 482 read 8. 422.
 p. 310-1: for *Ars Amatoria* 1. 779 read 1. 772.

Some of these may be survivals from originals, but would it not have been desirable to have had all the references checked with modern standard editions? I have used the Loeb, Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, and also Frazer's *Fasti*.

Such reference to modern classical texts would have impressed the editors, as it has impressed me, with the constant differences between eighteenth-century classical texts and our own. Many of the differences are perhaps minor, but somehow it does not seem right to perpetuate rejected readings, and I would have liked the modern reading to appear within square brackets after the reading which classical scholars now reject. The preference is, however, purely personal. Strangely enough, I notice that in one or two places a glance has been given at modern editions, for a correction is placed within square brackets, as in p. 221 above. Also on p. 229 there is an emendation of the type desired in the quotation from Tibullus, 3, 4, 17 [18]:

Mundum, caeruleis [caeruleo] laverat amne rotas

I have collected a list of twenty-three quotations where emendation of this kind should have been done, according to the best modern texts. Instead of offering these, I should like to offer two obvious misprints:

p. 184. Ovid: *for coetpa read coepta*

p. 288. Cicero: *for ad mundum contemplandum read ad mundum contemplandum.*

3. General misprints.

p. 178, vi, 1-4: Kitchin. *for dwarfe read dwarf.*

p. 183, xv: Todd. This is not in Todd's notes.

p. 196, 5th line from bottom: *for Hymenoe read Hymemae, and for (41) read (61).*

p. 215, 11th line from bottom: *for prankin read prank in.*

p. 216, top line: *for Karsie read karsie.*

p. 216, 11th line from top: *for 1605 read 1606.*

p. 223, 7th line from top: *for Winstanley read Winstanley (p. lvii).*

This note does not appear among Miss Winstanley's notes, as the absence of a page-reference implies, but in her introduction.

p. 239, 8th line from bottom: *for Thyselean read Thyestean.*

p. 252, 9th line from bottom: *for Tamburlaine read Tamburlaine.*

p. 257: *for v. 5 read v. 6.*

p. 267: *for Winstanley read Winstanley (p. lvii).*

p. 283, 15th line from bottom: *for Graunde Amour read Graunde Amoure.*

- p. 289, xlii. 8 : *for Hycke-Scorner read Hycke-Scorner.*
 p. 290, para. 2 : McArthur *cf.* p. 554 : Macarthur.
 p. 310, 5th line from bottom : *for battel read battle.*
 p. 316, 8th line from bottom : *for Heros read Heroes.*
 p. 316, 3rd line from bottom : *for Custome read Customs.*
 p. 336, 7th line from top : *for dark read darke.*
 p. 337, bottom line : insert comma after "world."
 p. 339, 6th line from top : *for distills read distils.*
 p. 365, 9th line from bottom : *for catholicks read catholics.*
 p. 377, 9th line from bottom : *for the fight in read the fight is.*
 p. 417, 3rd line from bottom : *for sesuality read sensuality.*
 p. 441, 2nd line from top : *for de début read le début* (error in original).
 p. 441, 9th line from bottom : *for su read sur.*
 p. 441, 7th line from bottom : *for l'idée read d'idée.*
 p. 442, 5th line from top : *for jourir read jouir.*
 p. 551, List of Editions : insert Morris, G., and Hales, J. Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser. 1869.
 p. 551, Grosart, A.B. . . . *for 8 vols. read 9 vols.*
 p. 552, Crawford, Charles : *between 101-3 and 203-5 insert 142-4.*

Could not Ker's edition of Dryden's *Essays* have been used instead of Scott's 1808 edition? And on pp. 314-15, should not the Dryden quotation (1693) come before the Blackmore quotation (1695)? In their discussion (p. 449) of the history of interest in the historical allegory the editors have overlooked Ben Jonson and Steele (*Spectator* No. 540).

Can we not plead with the editors of this undertaking to make their work absolutely unimpeachable, a work of which it could be said that it is faultless in detail, as well as magnificent in conception? It would be a great pity if this work came to be regarded as insufficiently accurate for direct use.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

A Looking-Glass for London and England. By THOMAS LODGE and ROBERT GREENE. 1594. Reprinted under the direction of W. W. Greg (Malone Society Reprints). 1932. Oxford University Press (for the Malone Society). Pp. xxxiii +[101].

In this reprint the Malone Society has given us another Elizabethan text in which full confidence can be placed, prefaced by an Introduction that is a model of economical and scrupulously exact statement of fact. The reprint is based on the first quarto of 1594, of which the

only copy known to exist is now in the Huntington Library. The Introduction records what is known of the contemporary stage history of the play and the inter-relation of the early quartos. Churton Collins's list of variant readings has been checked and corrected, and an account is also given of the MS. additions and corrections found in a unique copy of a black letter quarto (now in Chicago) which was used as a prompt copy some time during the first half of the seventeenth century.

One or two questions are raised in the Introduction which would seem to admit of a more conclusive solution than has been given. The confusion in Sc. III can, I think, be cleared up by assuming that there were only three speaking parts in this scene: the Smith's man (described as *Smith*) and two associates, the first (*Ruffian*) peaceful and pro-*Smith*, the second (*Clowne*) quarrelsome and anti-*Smith*. Then in Sc. VII when these same three characters reappear the master of the *Smith* of Sc. III appears as *Smith* and a revision of the names of the three characters of the earlier scene became necessary; the *Smith*'s man, before described as *Smith*, is now described as *Clowne*, and the *Ruffian* and *Clowne* of Sc. III appear as *Ruffian 1* and *Ruffian 2*. The confusion in Sc. III caused by the alteration of the names of the characters when they reappear in Sc. VII is increased by the fact that in Q1, Q2 and Q5 there are eight apparent omissions of the speaker's name in the stage directions. These appear at ll. 223, 233, 239, 243, 258, 263, 277 and 281. I do not think it is possible, however, to give the first seven of these to *Smith*. Ll. 223, 233, 243, 258, 263 and 277 can undoubtedly be attributed to him, and l. 281 (on the strength of Q3 and Q4) can be given to *Clowne*, but a difficulty occurs at l. 239. *Smith* has just boasted that Vulcan followed his occupation and the text then runs as follows:

[l. 238] *Clowne*. I, but he was a Cuckold.

[l. 239] That was the reason sir he cald your father cousin, paltry smith,
[l. 240] why in this one word thou hast defaced their worshipful
occu- [l. 231] pation.

[l. 242] *Clowne*. As how?

Q3 and Q4 give ll. 239-241 to *Smith*, but these lines cannot be spoken by *Smith* as they are addressed to him. If there is any omission at all here these lines must be given to *Ruffian*, but in view of the provocative nature of the whole of ll. 238-241 these lines are best regarded as making one speech by *Clowne*, *Ruffian* intervening briefly

at l. 242; *i.e.* there is no omission here, but an anomalous paragraph at l. 239 (cf. l. 273) and a wrong speaker's name at l. 242. Lastly, with reference to this scene, the rebuke administered to *Clowne* at l. 223—"O *Peter, Peter*, put vp thy sword"—is clearly an allusion to St. Peter's cutting off of Malchus' ear (John xviii. 11) and does not incorporate, as is suggested in this Introduction, the *Clowne's* Christian name.

Many of the confusions in this play seem to me to be the result not so much of collaboration as of one actor's taking several parts. *Crete* in the interval of his banishment was probably playing the part of one of the *Ruffians*. He does not appear in *Rasni's* train in Sc. vii when the *Ruffians* are on the stage, but appears later with *Rasni* in Sc. xvi when they are not there. There are more than thirty speaking parts in *A Looking Glasse*, so that several minor roles must have fallen to the lot of one actor, and probably the form of the play with its constant pauses—while *Jonah*, the *Angel* and *Hosea* hold the stage—and many of the apparently unnecessary and contradictory features of its plot (the banishment of *Crete*, the murder of *Ruffian 1* and the removal of *Radagon*) were due to acting considerations at some time in the play's stage history.

It seems to me that several of the readings in Q1 marked as certainly or probably incorrect might have been allowed to stand without question since they represented legitimate linguistic forms in their day. *Slouings* (l. 253) for "slovens," *Mee-things* (l. 2069) for "methinks" and *ouershead* (l. 2408) for "overshade" were very probably what Lodge or Greene wrote. *Thee* (l. 130) for "thou," *thinkes* (l. 2097) for "think" (pres. indic. pl.) and *burns* (l. 2396) for "burn" (pres. indic. pl.) are not impossible grammatical forms. *Subiect* (l. 2111) in the sentence

my burthen greater is,
Then euery priuate subiect in my land

should be retained in view of the still common habit of omitting the "s," in the last of two "possessives," and the interrogative adverb in *How cheere?* (l. 1958) might remain, provided "cheer" is taken as a verb.

ALICE WALKER.

Collections. Vol. II, Part III. The Malone Society. London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. iv+233-438+vii.

THE Malone Society gives generous measure in the latest instalment of its *Collections*, which completes a volume begun in 1913 with M. Feuillerat's "Blackfriars Records." Sir Edmund Chambers points out that Thomas Hearne saw *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore* in 1728, when it belonged to his friend John Murray. Dr. Greg reports the turning up of several play catalogues published between 1680 and 1792, including a revised issue in which Langbaine repudiates for his list "the Heathenish Name of Momus Triumphans." The cues and speeches for the actor of God in a miracle play, written in an Elizabethan hand, apparently in Herefordshire, are edited by Dr. Greg under the name of *Processus Satanae*. The part was found at Welbeck Abbey just in time for Dr. Greg to mention it in his *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*. He also reproduces in facsimile and transcribes the two leaves of a Protestant interlude preserved at Lambeth Palace, which he christens *Somebody and Others, or the Spoiling of Lady Verity*.

Most of the book is devoted to records of special value for stage history. Frequent rewards to players at Ipswich were cited by Jeaffreson when he calendared the town archives in 1883. Mr. V. B. Redstone now publishes a complete list of such payments from the Ipswich Chamberlains' Accounts between 1555 and 1625. The new extracts show that Shakespeare's company visited Ipswich in 1595 and 1603. The players of Ferdinando, Earl of Derby, were still travelling under his name in May 1594, at Ipswich as at Southampton, though he had died on April 16. The fact that Pembroke's men were at Ipswich in the two following years proves that that company did not vanish, as had been supposed, between 1593 and 1597.

"Dramatic Records of the City of London" have been searched out by Miss Anna Jean Mill from the Repertories, Journals, and Letter Books at the Guildhall. Sir Edmund Chambers adds brief notes to the documents, which extend from 1522 to 1615. Many interesting attempts at regulation of plays and pastimes are recorded, most of them in the first thirty years of Elizabeth's reign, after which the players were generally too strong for the City authorities. I do not think that Rice Gwynn, arrested with William Pollard in 1608 for suffering a play to be acted in the Whitefriars, can be identified

with Richard Gunnell. Gwynn and Pollard were not necessarily actors. The name "gadlowe" on p. 290 is an error for "Tadlowe," and the very modern phrase, "John marya being a Synnger borne," should read, as it does in the original Repertory, "John Marya being a Str^unger borne."

The Lord Chamberlain's papers were first quoted from by Malone and Chalmers, and Mrs. Stopes declared that her extracts in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* for 1910 "exhaust the information preserved in the Lord Chamberlain's Books up till 1641." But her misreadings are responsible for the inclusion in Nungezer's valuable *Dictionary of Actors* of such ghost-names as John "Danner" for John Daunce, George "Gibbes" for George Giles, Oliver "Howes" for Oliver Jones, "Allingham" for Allington, "Pettington" for Pettingham, and "Soyles" for Styles (p. 380 of the present volume). Full and trustworthy texts of the relevant entries are here printed for the first time by Professor Allardyce Nicoll and Miss Eleanore Boswell (now Mrs. Stuart Murrie), with notes by Sir Edmund Chambers. Earlier extracts were no more exhaustive than they were accurate, and among other new material is an interesting Petition Book of Lord Chamberlain Pembroke extending from 1626 to 1637. This book has been unknown except for a few entries quoted by Professor Nicoll, and by Dr. G. E. Bentley in *Modern Language Notes* for June 1929, and in *Review of English Studies* for April 1930. Dr. Bentley cited a petition of Francis Heath against John Bugge which is not printed here, and I have noticed some twenty-four further entries in the same Petition Book, which have likewise been overlooked, including references to Heming, Sir Henry Herbert, and Richard Brome. The seventy printed, however, are transcribed with admirable accuracy, and they give us glimpses of Jonson and Massinger in debt to Nathan Field's brother Nathaniel, the bookseller, and of "the Kings Players complayning of intermingleing some passages of witches in old playes to y^e p^rjudice of their designed Comedye of the Lancashire witches."

MARK ECCLES.

English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson. A study of its literary aspects. By W. FRASER MITCHELL. London: The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1932. Pp. xii+516. 21s. net.

THIS learned volume is really a kind of by-product of the revived interest in that versatile genius, John Donne. The Introduction explains how it was the study of the poet-dean's sermons and the wish to place him in his proper setting that led the author on to this more extended study. The field is a fruitful one, for by general acknowledgment the century from James I's accession to the death of William III is the golden age of English preaching. The only other period that can be put in comparison is the latter half of the nineteenth century, when such great and varied masters of the art were at work—each supreme in his own kind—as Newman and Frederick Robertson, Liddon, Spurgeon and Church. But the outstanding figures of the seventeenth century were more numerous and perhaps greater—Donne and Andrewes, Barrow and Jeremy Taylor, South and Tillotson, Owen, Leighton and Richard Baxter. Their art was favoured, no doubt, by the times they lived in. With no newspapers, no public meetings and no wireless, the preacher and the pamphleteer alone—and the first much more than the second—were able to reach the public ear and thus guide or form public opinion. That kind of pulpit influence has long since passed, and well that it is so, though we can hardly subscribe to Mr. Mitchell's surely too despondent view of the light in which the sermon is regarded nowadays, as apt to be "a somewhat trivial concomitant of public worship."

Mr. Mitchell's book is the fruit of years of labour and research, in which he has had the encouragement and friendly help of a number of scholars, such as Professor Grierson and the President of Magdalen. Some of the paths the explorer has cut—for instance, through the jungle of Puritan and anti-Puritan polemics—hardly seem to lead anywhere; but that also is part of the explorer's service to us. This task, once done, need not be done over again. Of the great figures of his story we are given lifelike pictures, along with sound and illuminating criticism of their work. The melancholy question, it is true, is apt to haunt the reader, Does any one nowadays read these admirable authors? Even Jeremy Taylor's golden periods, exquisite as the finest things in Ruskin, or the great Lancelot

Andrewes of the *Memoranda Sacra*, or Tillotson—the only Primate, it was said, who was also indisputably the first preacher of his age (there might have been another two hundred years later, if Mr. Gladstone had had his way and sent Dean Church to Canterbury)—have hardly any to listen to them now. Let us not think, however, that their work was in vain. The art of preaching, as our author well points out, is an evolutionary process, to which every great exponent of the art contributes something. And if Tillotson himself be now almost a silent voice, perhaps none has set forth better than he the aim of all true preaching, the producing of “a substantial and solid, a discreet and unaffected piety, which makes no great noise and show, but expresses itself in a constant and serious devotion, and is accompanied with the fruits of goodness and kindness and righteousness towards men.”

DUNCAN C. MACGREGOR.

The Works of John Milton. Columbia University edition under the general editorship of F. A. PATTERSON. New York : Columbia University Press ; London : Humphrey Milford. 18 vols. £24.

Vols. V to X. Vol. V, 1932 : *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates, Eikonoklastes*, edited by William Haller, pp. xii+352. Vol. VI, 1932 : *A treatise of civil power in ecclesiastical causes, Considerations touching the likeliest means to remove Hirelings out of the Church, A letter to a friend concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth, The Present Means and brief Delineation of a Free Commonwealth, The Readie and Easie way to establish a Free Commonwealth, Brief notes upon a late Sermon, Of true Religion, Heresie, Schism, Toleration*, edited by William Haller ; *Articles of Peace . . . Observations, A declaration or Letters Patents of the Election of this Present King of Poland*, edited by Frank Allen Patterson ; *Accedence Commenc'd Grammar*, edited by George Philip Krapp, pp. xii+372. Vol. VII, 1932 : *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*, edited by Clinton W. Keyes, with a translation by Samuel Lee Wolff, pp. viii+588. Vol. VIII, 1933 : *Defensio Secunda*, edited by Eugene J. Strittmatter, with the translation of George Burnett, London, 1809, revised by Moses Hadas, pp. viii+266. Vol. IX, 1933 : *Pro Se Defensio*

(by the same editor and translators), pp. viii+308. Vol. X, 1932: *The History of Britain, A Brief History of Moscovia*, edited by George Philip Krapp, pp. xii+388.

(The English publishers of the Columbia Milton give the English public the benefit of monetary fluctuations, and the whole set of Milton is now offered for £24 instead of £32.)

THE American editors continue their work with the same generally admirable methods and results already noticed here. Their good services to scholarship are perhaps most apparent in this section of their work, the prose pamphlets, English and Latin, written during Milton's political career. Most of them were practically unobtainable; although several had been edited recently by American scholars, they had hardly circulated to Europe. *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* and *the Readie and Easy Way to establish a Free Commonwealth* are masterpieces of political thinking; put by the side of the latter part of the *Defensio Secunda* they constitute a body of criticism of democracy that could be very advantageously meditated upon nowadays. We forget too easily that Milton was not only a critic of kings and tyrants. He has also made vital observations on the essential principles on which democracies should be worked; and political thinkers of to-day would derive great profit from a close study of his ideas. The craze for explaining everything by economic factors had not yet set in; and the older and better method of blaming and somewhat regulating human nature can be seen at work in Milton's pamphlets. We dare not hope that practical politics will be changed by the publication of the Columbia Milton; but students of political ideas will have no excuse left for not knowing what Milton knew.

The Eikonoklastes, the *First Defence* and the *Third Defence* (the practically unknown *Defensio Pro Se*) yield much less to the thinker. They will amuse the scholar. The handy Vol. IX (*Defensio Pro Se*) ought to be for some time on all students' tables to atone a little for the long (and on the whole deserved) oblivion that had fallen on the *Third Defence*. It is, on the whole, a monument of bad faith; and that, from Milton, should be closely considered. Here the Columbia editors have done a great service to scholarship, but little service to Milton.

The translation of the *First Defence* seems, on a rough preliminary testing, to have been competently done, and anyway to be a great

improvement on the current Bohn translation. The good practice of reprinting mainly a sound early nineteenth-century translation of two Latin Defences makes us hope that Summer's translation of the *De Doctrina* will also be adhered to.

The History of Britain is, of course, gratefully received, though adding little to our interest or amusement. But the short *Moscovia* at the end, which is full of curious detail, is by itself likely to prevent Vol. X from slumbering unopened on library shelves. Mirsky's 1929 edition had recalled public attention to this interesting by-product of Milton's intellectual restlessness.

DENIS SAURAT.

Henry Vaughan and the Hermetic Philosophy. By ELIZABETH HOLMES. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1932. Pp. x+62. Price 4s. 6d.

IN presenting his translation of Nollius' *Hermetical Physick*, Henry Vaughan remarks: "For my owne part, I honour the truth where ever I find it, whether in an old, or a new Booke, in *Galen*, or in *Paracelsus*." The addiction of Vaughan's contemporaries to out-of-the-way reading may be illustrated by Browne's allusion to Hermes, and by the acquaintance which Professor Saurat shows Milton to have had with the Cabbala. There is less ample evidence of acquaintance with the Hermetic writers in Henry Vaughan than in his twin-brother Thomas, who says of Cornelius Agrippa that to him, "next to God, I owe all that I have." Again, although Thomas alone mentions Boehme, it is likely enough that Henry also was attracted to his writings, which were appearing in English versions in the years immediately preceding *Silex Scintillans*. Miss Elizabeth Holmes, who has already published a discerning essay on Elizabethan imagery, has set out in the present book to throw what light she can upon Vaughan's sacred verse from these unfamiliar sources. She succeeds in establishing a close similarity in thought and phrase between the two brothers, and in showing the probable connection between Boehme and Henry Vaughan. She is less successful in proving any direct and conscious borrowing of thought or word by Henry Vaughan from the so-called Hermetic writers. An attentive reader of Vaughan will confess to being puzzled by words or phrases which appear to have for the poet some special or esoteric meaning,

and perhaps the key may be supplied from these forgotten writers. But Miss Holmes's instances are not always convincing, and we may suspect that she has not herself attempted a complete survey of this remote and unattractive field. It is difficult to make sure that borrowings, if they are such, are consciously made, especially when we find them in more than one author of the time. Donne has anticipated Thomas Vaughan in using the odd image of "the crucified Serpent"; Donne and Herbert, besides Henry Vaughan, use the word "tincture" in an almost technical sense. After stating that the correspondence between the macrocosm and the microcosm, "with the 'sympathy' it involves, is the secret of Hermetic medicine," Miss Holmes quotes Herbert's lines:

Herbs gladly cure our flesh, because that they
Finde their acquaintance there.

Is Herbert likely to have himself gone so far afield for the idea, and is it after all so much of a secret?

Miss Holmes is at her best in detecting the characteristic features of Vaughan's thought and diction. She finds interest in the less immediately interesting poems, and with some subtlety she makes clear the difference between Vaughan and Marvell. She is less sure-footed in her rare incursions into biography. Like some others, she finds the main cause of the difference of tone between *Olor Iscanus* (of which the writing was apparently completed by 1647) and *Silex Scintillans*, a difference which is commonly described as conversion, in his serious illness. But we know of this illness only from the title-page and dedication of *Flores Solitudinis* (1654; dedication, 1653), and from the preface (September 1654) in express reference to the poem contemplating death at the end of Part II of *Silex Scintillans*. The change of tone is already fully apparent in Part I of *Silex*, published in 1650, and besides the cause which Vaughan himself gives, we must take note of the death of his younger brother in the summer of 1648, which occasioned some of the most remarkable poems in the volume of 1650. Miss Holmes might also have helped the reader to see the relationship between the places variously described as Newton-by-Usk, Scethrog, St. Bridget's and Llansantffraed.

F. E. HUTCHINSON.

The Popular Novel in England, 1770-1800. By J. M. S. TOMPKINS. London: Constable & Co. Ltd. 1932. Pp. xii+388. 12s. 6d. net.

THOSE who know Miss Tompkins' earlier work on Mrs. Radcliffe and James White will welcome this fuller and more general study of the lesser eighteenth-century novel. The period chosen for survey, though it looks arbitrary, is not so in reality: the publication of *Humphry Clinker* in 1771 ended the great period of the eighteenth-century novel, and nothing of first-rate importance appeared (with the possible exception of *Evelina*) till *Castle Rackrent* in 1800 ushered in the age of Maria Edgeworth, Jane Austen, and Scott. There is, moreover, a very marked decline in quantity as well as in quality: in 1780 the reviews noticed only about a dozen novels, as against forty in 1770 and fifty in 1800, and it was generally felt, in the 'seventies and 'eighties particularly, that the novel was played out, its possibilities as a form of literature exhausted.

Miss Tompkins, as she explains in her Preface, approaches this mass of third-, fourth-, even tenth-rate fiction as a popular amusement rather than as a literary form, tracing out the qualities dear to the frequenters of circulating libraries; she follows the old patterns through imitations of imitations, while at the same time she is continually on the look-out for "experiment and creative adventure." With imaginative sympathy she gets behind the conventions and absurdities which so often put off a modern reader, but which are in many cases little more absurd than some of the familiar conventions of modern novels. "Dead books can provide little information when exposed on the gibbet of scorn," and Miss Tompkins passes lightly over the absurdities which inspired *Love and Freindship* and *Northanger Abbey* and *The Heroine*, the incoherence and discursiveness satirised in Beckford's *Modern Novel Writing*; like Jane Bennet, she takes the good and makes it still better, and says little or nothing of the bad. In one respect this is unfortunate, for the reader is left with a much higher opinion of the novels in general than they really merit; but on the whole the method is justified, and leaves Miss Tompkins room to examine and to discuss fully the varying types found within her period, from the sentimental novel "in a series of letters" most common in the 'seventies to the Gothic novel and the philosophic novel of the 'nineties, and she carries her task through with great insight and

with a generous appreciation of the writers' aims. Occasionally, however, Miss Tompkins hardly seems to get back fully to the eighteenth-century point of view; for instance, the belief in the absolute authority of a parent must have been stronger than she seems willing to allow (pp. 84-87), even though in real life it was exerted less tyrannically than in the novels.

Miss Tompkins' study does not claim to be exhaustive—indeed, it could not be, for only about half the novels of her period are now accessible in the British Museum and other great public libraries—and in one or two cases she has missed a novel which most forcibly illustrates her point. She discusses, for instance, the didactic moral which was regarded, more particularly by the women novelists of the period, as the main justification for novel-writing, but does not mention the example of Maria Susanna Cooper, who went to the length of re-writing her *Letters between Emilia and Harriet* thirteen years after it was published because she had not been sufficiently strict in her ideal of filial duty—she had allowed her heroine to make a promise to the hero during her parents' absence. It is true that the said heroine had no doubt of her parents' approbation, and in fact received it as soon as they returned; nevertheless, it was a bad example, and the story had to be recast accordingly. Again, the Minerva Press was not content with a casual reference to its activities as in *Frederic and Caroline* (p. 8): the heroine of *The Follies of St. James' Street*, reduced to writing novels for a livelihood, waxed eloquent over the generosity with which she was treated by the Minerva Press, and recommended all in her position to offer their wares to Mr. Lane.

One difficulty of her task Miss Tompkins could only evade—that of deciding on the relative popularity of individual novels. Some, one knows, had an outstanding success; but of the others it is generally impossible to say which enjoyed a short measure of popularity and which had none. The reviews are not infallible guides, and contemporary references are scanty; survival is largely a matter of chance. When, in 1928, Mr. Miles edited *The Man of Feeling* for the Scholartis Press, he could trace no edition between the original one of 1771 and the "New Edition" of 1773, though the novel is known to have been exceedingly popular; it is perhaps worth recording here that a copy of the Second Edition, 1771, appeared shortly afterwards in the catalogue of Mr. Ridgell Trout, that it was inspected by his courtesy, and was found to have the

revised text noted in the 1773 edition. When, therefore, Miss Tompkins quotes from the preface of *Santa-Maria, or the Mysterious Pregnancy*, "Things MAY come out . . . to make the sensitive soul thrill with horror—to make the very hair stand perched on its native habitual roost, where so long it had lain recumbent," and adds the comment, "And the sensitive soul, tired of recumbent hair, bought the book" (p. 222), one enjoys the phrasing, but wonders what is her evidence for the fact.

A few details call for comment. Despite the ascription in the British Museum catalogue, the *Male-Coquette* of 1770 (pp. 55 n., 151) is not an early unacknowledged edition of Jane Timbury's *Male Coquet* of 1788, of which a copy is preserved in the National Library of Scotland, but a different novel altogether; Miss Timbury's second novel, *The Triumph of Friendship; or, the History of Charles Courtney and Miss Julia Melville*, which Miss Tompkins has not traced (p. 55 n.), appeared in 1789, and was noticed in the *Critical Review* in September and in the *Monthly Review* in October of that year. Alexander Bicknell's *The Benevolent Man; or, the History of Mr. Belville* (p. 233, n.) was published in 1775 (see the *Critical Review*, October, or the *Monthly Review*, December 1775), and his *Isabella; or, the Rewards of Good Nature* the following year (*Monthly*, August 1776). A number of misprints also have escaped correction: p. 117, *pruden*; p. 186, *Louise* for *Louisa*; p. 229 n., *hi* for *his*; p. 271 n., *Marntua*; p. 340 n., *receiver* for *reviewer*; 363 n., *Ethelwulf* for *Ethelwulf*; 364 n., *Vathet*; 380, *Montino* for *Montoni*; a comma has also dropped out after *Flammenberg* on p. 369.

H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS.

Dorothy Wordsworth: A Biography. By ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1933. Pp. xiv + 428. 21s. net.

At long last we are given a worthy biography of Dorothy Wordsworth, who is presented by Professor de Selincourt in such a way as to make the reader realise how and why her influence and her personality counted for so much in her brother's development as a poet and in his life as a man. It is probably true that Dorothy herself would have considered the portrait over-drawn: certainly

she would have protested that not enough had been made of her weaknesses and that too much stress had been laid upon her powers of literary expression. The judgment of the unbiased reader is more likely to coincide with that of Dr. de Selincourt, who gives chapter and verse for every statement made and convinces by the accumulated evidence which he produces. Nor must it be supposed that he attempts to present a model of perfection: he is content to re-vivify a delightful and very human woman, largely by allowing her to speak for herself in letters and journals and in the life which she led and which is described by herself and her friends. Wordsworth, for all the lack of early recognition by the public, was a very fortunate person. It can have been given to few men and to fewer poets to have in their household two such women as his wife and his sister, whose perfect love was spoiled by no trace of foolish adulation, and who were worthy of the equally passionate devotion with which he responded to it.

Dorothy is, throughout the book, the centre of the picture, but her likeness could not be true to life unless the poet and all his family formed the circle which revolved round her and gave meaning to her existence. Dr. de Selincourt establishes the fact that has sometimes been overlooked, that Dorothy's love for William was so ardent as to preclude the need for marriage. It is probably true that at one period her devotion to Coleridge came close to what in anyone else would have been the desire for physical union, but Coleridge was already married to one woman and was soon to be in love with another, and these facts, added to Dorothy's devotion to her brother, prevented any such result from their intimacy. There was literally no place in her life which marriage could have filled. Mary was her chosen friend long before she became William's wife: short of the physical tie, their children were as much Dorothy's as their own, and no one of the three elders appears for a moment to have envisaged a household in which they were not all equally at home. The brother and sister were drawn closely together in early childhood by genuine community of spirit and likeness of character: neither of them ever swerved in the determination to spend their lives together, and both profited incalculably by the fulfilment of their desire.

Thus, it would be altogether a mistake to think of Dorothy's as a frustrated life. On the contrary, though it was one of self-abnegation and of total absorption in the concerns of William and

his family, it was thus that she found happiness and completion. It is indeed arguable whether these could have been so fully hers by any other means, and it is certain that her ardent feelings must in any circumstances have led her to selfless devotion to some individual, with its inevitable sequence of suffering. We may regret that she spent so much of her energy on the domestic duties which sapped her strength, but it is probable that her zest for life and experience, and her highly-strung nature would in any case have overtaxed her physical strength. Her genius best expressed itself in living and in feeling. But genius she possessed and there can be no doubt of her literary power. If she was indeed only "half a poet," she was nevertheless a prose-writer "with a rare gift of description" and an "infallible sense of the details that make a picture." Professor de Selincourt has had access to much hitherto unpublished material, letters to Mrs. Clarkson and Lady Beaumont, diaries and journals, etc., and he has selected and quoted from these with admirable skill so as to enhance the interest of his narrative at the same time as he makes us better acquainted with Dorothy's own prose style. Her account of the tragedy of the Greens (pp. 224-36) shows the restraint and pathos that were hers in one type of description, while the *Recollections of a Tour in Scotland* (Appendix 2) serve to illustrate her skill in another kind. Whatever she writes pulsates with life and feeling, and she is no less truly a woman-of-letters because she disclaims any right to the title. Her descriptive prose is of a very high order, combining as it does, felicity of phrase with accuracy of observation and of perception. What Dr. de Selincourt says of the *Grasmere Journal* (pp. 118-19) may serve as a general criticism of her writings: "At times her entire lack of self-consciousness becomes a lack of humour, and she reveals the naivety of a child. . . . But the stark fidelity with which she sets down whatever might pass through her mind gives to the whole journal the stamp of a living human document, and throws into stronger relief her power as an artist to recreate the world about her in pictures of a beauty proportionate to the intensity of her feeling."

As we read what she wrote and are enabled to gauge the depth of her emotional life, we learn to appreciate the validity of Wordsworth's estimate of her: "In tenderness of heart I do not honestly believe she was ever exceeded by any of God's creatures. In loving-kindness she has no bounds." She would have asked no

better epitaph, but the rest of us will be grateful to Dr. de Selincourt for his understanding and masterly expansion of the theme. If his book indeed bears "more resemblance to the old-fashioned *Life and Letters* than to a biography in the approved modern manner," it is assuredly none the worse on that account. It is good to read an exposition so just, sympathetic and discerning.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

The Later Wordsworth. By EDITH C. BATHO. London: Cambridge University Press. 1933. Pp. xii+418. 16s. net.

MISS BATHO has produced what in these days must be considered a remarkable and unusual kind of book. She has written a description of Wordsworth which takes account of all the available evidence and attempts from that to deduce what manner of man he was, how he struck his contemporaries and what were his opinions on politics and religion. Next she proceeds to examine how far, if at all, the legends of his "apostacy" and gradual ossification are founded upon truth. It is a relief for once to be quit of theories and theorists and to be presented with facts by a competent scholar who is neither an amateur psycho-analyst nor an imitator of Lytton Strachey without the virtue and wit of his original.

Miss Batho adopts a more laborious and less pretentious method, but she attains a more useful end. It may be said without exaggeration that *The Later Wordsworth* presents us with a fresh and completely convincing portrait. All lovers of the poet and of his poetry must rejoice at this vindication of his character as a man with its exposure of the fallacies of those who have held him up to scorn as "reactionary and obscurantist." Here at last is an end of the oft-repeated fable that Wordsworth ceased to be either a great poet or a great man some thirty-five or forty years before his death: Miss Batho provides ample proofs to the contrary. She explains how the misconception first arose among nineteenth-century critics who were out of political and theological sympathy with him, and how their condemnation has been repeated and exaggerated until it has come to be accepted without investigation.

She begins by a review of the opinions of Wordsworth which were formed by some of those who made his acquaintance only in middle or later life. He is shown in their comments as one "who

easily got on good terms with young men," "a patient and courteous listener" to the juniors with whom he conversed as equals, "as agreeable in society as he is admirable in his power of talking"; "very cheerful, merry, courteous and talkative . . . more conversable and with a greater flow of animal spirits than Southey." John Stuart Mill was particularly delighted with the poet's freedom from prejudice "and the largeness and expansiveness of his feelings" (October 1831). William Rowan Hamilton, the astronomer, thirty-five years the poet's junior, first met him in 1827 and the friendship then formed was lasting and of immense value to both the men, who, as Hamilton phrased it, were "occupied in the study of Truth and of Nature," while Wordsworth (1829) likes "to see and think of [Hamilton] among the stars, and between death and immortality," and regrets, after reading one of Hamilton's lectures (1833), that he has not himself devoted more time to the study of mathematics.

Pictures drawn of the poet at still later periods all agree in representing "a man of strong intellect, of strong feelings, of sturdy massive individuality . . . the strong intellect . . . steeped in the strong feeling, but the man . . . always master of both," to quote the words of R. P. Graves, curate of Ambleside from 1835 onwards, and in close contact with him during the last fifteen years of his life. "Graves noted also 'another characteristic which largely enhanced one's satisfaction in intercourse with him . . . his willingness to discuss all subjects on first principles. . . . He continued to the end the expression both in conversation and in poetry, of his early love of liberty and of political action on the part of a free people; only in later years he leant more stress than he had done on the requisite qualifications for such action.'" Miss Batho cites various other examples of the estimation in which Wordsworth was held by his acquaintances. We have space to refer only to his interview with Cooper, the Chartist,¹ whom he surprised first by his greeting to a "fellow-poet" (on the score of his *Prison Rhyme*), and then—the date was 1846—by saying "You were right. . . I have always said the people were right in what they asked: but you went the wrong way to get it." When Cooper "almost doubted [his] ears, being in the presence of the Tory Wordsworth," the words were repeated and emphasised: "there is nothing unreasonable in your

¹ Herford calls him Thomas Brown [*Wordsworth*, p. 203] and his poem *The Purgatory of Suicides*.

Charter : it is the foolish attempt at physical force, for which many of you have been blamable."

Miss Batho proceeds to analyse some current misconceptions of Wordsworth's relations with various friends and acquaintances, notably with Coleridge, the Leigh Hunt circle, Hazlitt, De Quincey and Landor. Far the most important and most interesting of these misconceptions concerns the new evidence brought to bear on the question of his attitude to his daughter's marriage with Quillinan. The present reviewer confesses gladly her own relief at the discovery that, what she once stigmatised as Wordsworth's inexcusable "parental selfishness" in that matter, merited no such harsh description. Miss Batho's evidence (pp. 39-41) proves that Wordsworth was probably not approached on the subject until the end of 1837, and certainly not before 1836, when Quillinan first discovered Dora's love for him. It is even possible that her father's consent was not asked until the end of 1838;¹ the correct date of those letters of his which Knight put ten years earlier. The marriage took place in 1841, so that the supposed long delay owing to Wordsworth's refusal of his consent did not in fact take place. His reluctance was real, but it was not due merely to his dread of parting with his beloved daughter; it may be ascribed in large measure to Quillinan's financial position, which made him unable to support a penniless wife. Ultimately the poet, who could ill afford to do so, made her an allowance which enabled them to marry and this was continued until Dora's death, and was discontinued then, only at Quillinan's request. His personal misery at parting with her considered, one may echo Miss Fenwick's comment at the time of the wedding on his self-conquest: "Mr. Wordsworth behaves beautifully."

There is no need here to give the dates and other proofs that the affair with Annette Vallon had no such influence on Wordsworth's subsequent career as has been ascribed to it by one or two recent critics whose attitude has never been taken seriously by those competent to form an opinion on the subject. But Miss Batho produces all the relevant evidence, and we may agree with her conclusion that "Wordsworth cannot, in his relations with Annette Vallon and with their daughter and grandchildren, be fairly accused of hardening in his emotional or moral nature."

¹ de Selincourt, *Dorothy Wordsworth*, p. 381, n., says it was probably not till 1838-1839.

It is impossible to summarise at equal length the chapters on *Politics* and on *Religion*. Suffice it here to quote the author's final sentence in the former section and to say that it is led up to by abundant proofs of Wordsworth's continued "warm and energetic interest" in many good causes and above all in "the fight against the abuses of the industrial system." She concludes: "His political development was a consistent development, not a swing to the left followed by a swing to the right;" or as she puts it a few pages earlier, he "had not lost in any true sense of the word, his enthusiasm for liberty and humanity, though he was, not unnaturally, more conscious of the dangers which beset them than in his youth." Similarly, Miss Batho argues for the consistency of Wordsworth's religious development and maintains that his theological position and his philosophical thought are not mutually contradictory, but that "there were actually in his early training those elements of pantheism and transcendentalism which are frequently ascribed to the influence of Coleridge," and which Wordsworth throughout his life found no difficulty in reconciling with the teachings of the Anglican Church as he interpreted these. It is, she believes, a fact that "the orthodoxy of his later years was a natural growth from the orthodoxy of his youth, and that neither depended on a rigid interpretation and acceptance of a small and limiting set of theological propositions."

In her last chapter, Miss Batho discusses whether Wordsworth in truth deteriorated as a poet in his later years, and how far the diminution in his output was due to the trachoma from which, on medical evidence, she believes him to have suffered. She makes it clear that his eye trouble was very much more protracted and severe than has been hitherto supposed, and that it must have affected his powers of concentration and composition to a degree which even his family did not realise. Nevertheless, while it may account for the non-completion of *The Recluse*, it did not prevent the composition of many exquisite shorter poems nor the alteration and improvement of many lines and passages in his earlier writings. Quite enough was written in the last years of his life to prove that he remained a great poet to the end. Though like many other poets, he produced the bulk of his work before he was fifty, it is not true that 1815 marked the end of his career: "he wrote less in the last 35 years of his life than Tennyson or Browning did, but what he wrote will compare with what they wrote in quality, if not in quantity."

"In literary criticism a certain minimum of historical and theological knowledge, as well as of the works of the author under consideration, is necessary," says Miss Batho. No one can read her study of Wordsworth and doubt that she possesses both the requisite equipment and the ability to make use of it. Her case also being for the most part a good one, it would have gained rather than lost by a less combative method of statement in some places.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Von F. HOLT-HAUSEN. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung. 1932, 1933. Lg. 1, pp. 80. Lg. 2, pp. 81-160. Lg. 3, pp. 161-240; Lg. 4, pp. 241-320; Lg. 5, pp. 321-400; Lg. 6, pp. xxviii + 401-428. Jede Lg. Mk. 3.

THE vast debt which Germanic students owe to Carl Winter's *Germanische Bibliothek* has been substantially increased by this competent addition to its lexicographical series. Till now the student of Old English etymology has had to satisfy himself either by laboriously collecting the information he needs from the *Oxford English Dictionary* or turning up the nearest cognate in such works as Feist's *Gotisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* or the similar Scandinavian work of Falk and Torp: for the casual citation of cognates in the great Anglo-Saxon Dictionary of Bosworth and Toller can in no sense be regarded as adequate, nor is there any reliable guide to the multitude of articles touching the etymology of individual words accessible only in periodicals. Professor Holthausen, therefore, has given us something which must be judged as a definitely pioneer work, for which every student of Old English will be especially grateful.

While frequently giving the most useful references on doubtful or difficult points, Professor Holthausen has achieved a remarkable feat of compression: for in the first four sections of his dictionary (each *Lieferung* contains exactly eighty pages), he has brought the work up to *sticcian*. This he has been able to do largely by omitting what may be termed the "prehistory" of the words, thus departing from the methods so valuably employed by Feist in Gothic and Falk and Torp in Norse. This omission, however, is only apparent, since the letters "*W. P.*" at the end of an explana-

tion (followed by a reference number) indicate to the persevering student how he may find the fullest possible information by consulting the great (though now very expensive) *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indo-germanischen Sprachen* of Walde and Pokorny. In fact, we are given in this manner a kind of index to the etymological material bearing on Old English contained in the last-named book.

Professor Holthausen appears to have "normalised" his spellings on a strictly West-Saxon basis, and space has not always permitted the necessary cross-referencing: similarly, the practice of giving compound words only under their second element and sometimes without cross-references saves space, but carries with it some possible inconvenience. For instance: to ascertain what the dictionary has to say of the famous *ealuscwæn* of *Beowulf* and *meoduscwæn* of *Andreas*, one must first "normalise" the second element of the compounds into *scwæn*; since only under this head are they mentioned and there is no cross-reference at *ealu* or *medu*: and when this final point is reached, the only reward is a direction to consult the just-published *Beowulfstudien* of Hoops.

With these slight disadvantages which are perhaps inseparable from such compression, there are occasional omissions or errors resulting from the same cause. Thus, there is no mention of the very interesting *Heardingas of Elene* and the *Runic Poem*, and the newly-discovered word *scægan* (discussed in *Medium Ævum*, Vol. I, No. 2) would have been noticed in a more ambitious dictionary. Again, to explain the mysterious *gasric* of the *Franks Casket*, Professor Holthausen cites a Gothic *gaisjan*, for whose existence there is no evidence.

A useful feature of the book is the inclusion of proper names throughout. For this is a matter too often neglected by lexicographers and one which offers many stumbling-blocks. Yet the laconic explanation of *Bio-wulf* as "bear" or "honey-robber" seems odd as a solitary comment on the name which all readers of Old English know best, and the author departs somewhat from his usual caution in definitely explaining *Sigelhearwa* as he does.

On the whole, however, the impression produced by Professor Holthausen's book is decidedly favourable, and the intelligent student of Old English philology, in view of its pioneering character, will find it a remarkably labour-saving device. Its information is (within its apparently prescribed limits) both wide and reasonably accurate.

The final *Lieferung* contains the Preface, in which Professor Holthausen carefully explains the underlying principles and methods of the whole work. Here we learn that, as one would expect, Clark Hall's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, supplemented from other collections, was found to be the only possible basis for a work of this relatively brief compass, since no attempt was to be made to examine the whole Old English vocabulary afresh. The Preface is followed by a most useful comprehensive bibliography of works bearing on all aspects of the subject, to which are added a list of the symbols used, a statement of the author's intentions in matters of quantity and stress, and a table of the vowels in accented syllables in Early West-Saxon which will help to remove any difficulty caused by the method of normalisation which is employed throughout. Pp. 416-428 consist of further references and corrections which had become necessary during the somewhat prolonged process of seeing the dictionary through the press.

Once again, as so often before, Professor Holthausen has materially added to the convenience of Anglo-Saxonists, and it may confidently be predicted that his *Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* will—pending a more ambitious work of the kind—be widely used and valued.

C. L. W.

The Reception of English Literature in Germany. By LAWRENCE MARSDEN PRICE. University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1932. Pp. xviii+596. 36s. net.

ALTHOUGH Professor Price does not mention the fact in his preface, this is a new edition, considerably revised and extended, of his *English-German Literary Influences*, published in two parts (*Bibliography and Survey*) in 1919-1920. It falls into three sections, dealing respectively with the eighteenth century and earlier, Shakespeare in Germany, and the nineteenth century and after, and there is a bibliography of some 120 pages. As Professor Price says, "the record of the reception of English literature in Germany in the eighteenth century is no obscure bypath, but is one of the main highroads of literary history," and the list of his chapter headings reads like the contents list of a history of English literature during

that period—Addison and the moralising weeklies, Pope, Thomson, Shaftesbury, the moralising drama, Young's *Night Thoughts*, Ossian, Percy's *Reliques*, Richardson and the moralising novel, Fielding, Sterne and Goldsmith. The book should be of considerable value to the student of English literature, for it emphasises the significance of a variety of matters which he might be inclined to take for granted. The indirect influence of Addison on German prose, for example, links the two literatures in a way which throws Addison himself into relief, while the German attitude to Byron illuminates a literary and psychological problem which is all the more interesting for its apparent insolubility.

The section dealing with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is of less importance and, as the author confesses, his work in this field has been less fruitful of results, but the views of German critics and poets on Shakespeare which are set out in the middle section of the book ought to be familiar to all Shakespeare students. The voluminous bibliography is invaluable.

WILLIAM ROSE.

SHORT NOTICES

Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages. Numbers one and two. Printed by Titus Wilson and Son of Kendal for Members of the School of English Language in the University of Leeds, 1932 and 1933. Pp. 55 and 88. 5s. each.

This little miscellany, which is fittingly dedicated to the memory of Joseph Wright, inaugurates a private venture of an interesting kind. It is an effort to bring before the learned public in an annual volume the work successfully submitted for research-degrees in the linguistic and mediæval branches of the Leeds University School of English. The promoters of the scheme hope at least to be able to print abstracts of all such dissertations and the more interesting portions of them in full; and this is obviously the utmost that could be attempted by an annual number of this size.

The list of dissertations by members of the Leeds University School of English, given on p. 55, suggests that there is valuable work which would have well merited publication lying in typescript in the University Library; and we would extend a cordial welcome to any effort at bringing research-work of sterling worth before the public.

These conveniently printed little volumes provide interesting articles dealing with matters of Old and Middle English, general linguistic theory, and Old Norse; and the members of the teaching staff of Leeds University English School have given practical support by adding their own contributions to those of their advanced students.

In Vol. I Professor Bruce Dickins contributes an extremely useful suggestion for the transcription of Old English Runic inscriptions, illustrating his scheme with a number of transliterations from his own examination of the stones. His note on the "Eps" coins too scores a valuable point. Miss R. Roberts' collation of the Glosses in the Vespasian Psalter and Hymns and Mr. G. L. Brook's

examination of the English lyrics of MS. Harley 2253 are of some value. Mr. A. S. C. Ross's *Outline of a Theory of Language* and Mr. R. M. Wilson's *Note on the Authorship of the Katherine Group* are convincing, though perhaps not of sufficient significance or novelty to justify their position in so small a collection. Apart from the two Old Norse contributions (of which more below), the one outstanding article is Mr. W. Taylor's really valuable and well-argued etymology of the word *Saracen*.

The possession of the Melsteð collection of Icelandic books, one which is in some ways probably unrivalled in this country, gives to Leeds University peculiar advantages in the study of Norse; and this, coupled with the guidance of Professor E. V. Gordon (till recently the director of this department), doubtless accounts for the fact that *Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages* owes most of what will make its first issue permanently valuable to the contributions of researchers into Old Norse. Mr. F. Mosby deals most effectively with a little problem of names connected with *Landnámabók* and *Laxdælasaga*. But the work of Dr. A. G. Hooper in publishing for the first time the fascinating and historically important *saga of Bragða-Óleir*, together with a clear and judicious introduction and textual foot-notes, deserves the highest praise. Even if this had occupied the whole volume, it would have more than justified the ambitions of the promoters. It renders it indispensable to all students of Icelandic literature, in this country as well as abroad, since it is the unique edition of the saga. Comparison of Dr. Hooper's text with rotographs of the principal MS. suggests too that the work has been done with accuracy.

The second number, though larger than the first, is less significant. Mr. Ross continues his study of general linguistic method by suggesting a fifteen-fold division of philology: and, aided by Miss R. Roberts, seeks to demonstrate that the problem of valuing philological statistics rightly is essentially mathematical. Mr. G. L. Brook adds a study of the (hypothetical) original dialects of the *Harley Lyrics*, which shows markedly the influence of the recent work in M. E. dialectology of Oakden and Miss Serjeantson. Professor Bruce Dickins, in a neat sketch of the *Ireland* MS. shows that the dates of this copy of three important romances must be shifted forward some 40 years (to *circa* 1450-1460) from that which has hitherto been accepted.

But this number will probably owe its permanent value to notable articles on *Lost Literature of Old and Middle English* and *Illustrations of Norse formulas in English*, contributed respectively by Mr. R. M. Wilson and Miss E. Olaszewska. These may fairly be described as pioneer work in their different fields.

The first of a projected series of monographs to be published by the same body is announced for this year. It is *Studies in the Accidence of the Lindisfarne Gospels* and is to be written by A. S. C. Ross.

C. L. W.

Seven Letters from Charles Lamb to Charles Ryle of the East India House, 1828-1832. Oxford University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. vi+7. 10s. 6d. net (250 copies).

The seven letters now for the first time printed have, with one exception, remained in the family of Charles Ryle, one of the two executors of Lamb's will, since the original receipt. They are not, it must be admitted, of very great interest or importance, but it was well that they should be made accessible, in a small edition, for the benefit of Lamb enthusiasts. The longest of the letters with its enclosing envelope is reproduced in four pages of colotype.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ANGLIA, Vol. LVIII. (New Series XLVI.), January 1934—

Farman Vindicatus (R. J. Menner), pp. 1-27.

The linguistic value of *Rushworth I*.

Ae. *neorx(e)nwang* "Paradies" (W. Krogmann), pp. 28-29.

Der anglonormannische Traktat des Walter von Bibbesworth in seiner Bedeutung für die Anglistik (J. Koch), pp. 30-77.

The Text of Cowley's Satire *The Puritan and the Papist* (J. H. A. Sparrow), pp. 78-102.

Kleine Studien zu Graves, Shenstone und Percy. I (H. Hecht), pp. 103-12.

Graves' *Recollection*.

BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. VII., 3rd Quarter, 1933—

King James I and the Bodleian Library Catalogue of 1620 (James P. R. Lyell), pp. 271-83.

Cancels in the Catalogue.

Henry Bell: 'A Naughty and Jugling Printer' (C. J. H.), pp. 284-86.

Piracy of pamphlet by Fabian Phillips, 1660.

Samuel Pepys and John Wallis (Rachael Poole), pp. 286-90.

Correspondence with reference to Wallis' portrait.

— 4th Quarter—

The Birth of a Chronicle (N. D.-Y.), pp. 325-28.

MSS. of the Durham Chronicle attributed to William de Chambre.

Thomas Pestell's Poems in MS. Malone 14 (Hannah A. Buchan), pp. 329-32.

Corrigendum by Advertisement (N. Ault), pp. 332-33.

In *The Daily Post-Boy*, March 1729.

Plate-Books (S. G.), pp. 333-34.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, MANCHESTER, Vol. 18, January 1934—

Shakespeare's Jew (H. B. Charlton), pp. 34-68.

Some Early Letters of Mark Pattison (F. C. Montague), pp. 156-76.

A Review and other Writings by Charles Dickens (M. Tyson), pp. 177-96.

Unpublished Letters of Arthur Henry Hallam from Eton (M. Zamick), pp. 197-248.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, Vol. 149, January 1934—

The 'Discoverer' of Burns (W. Forbes Gray), pp. 26-35.

DIALECT NOTES, Vol. VI., December 1933—

An American Glossary (R. H. Thornton), pp. 368-84.
Horse Sense—Johnnycake.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XV., December 1933—

The Merchant of Venice in the Eighteenth Century (F. T. Wood),
pp. 209-18.

The Date of *The History of Jacob and Esau* (G. Scheurweghs),
pp. 218-19.
Not before 1539.

— Vol. XVI., February 1934—

Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* (B. A. P. van Dam), pp. 1-17.

Linguistics and the Functional Point of View (J. R. Firth), pp. 18-24.

The Subjunctive in Old English (W. v. d. Gaaf and Max Förster),
p. 25.

'Forlorn Hope' (W. v. d. Gaaf), p. 25.
Use by Ælfric.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Vol. 164
(New Series 64), December 1933—

Spätme. Lehrgedichte (Schluss) (Karl Brunner), pp. 178-99.

Continued from Volume 161. Text and notes.

Volksbildungsarbeit der englischen Kirche im Zeitalter der Aufklärung
(Fritz Werth), pp. 200-09.

Die Runeninschrift der Silberspange von Sheffield (Hermann Harder),
pp. 250-52.

Nc. leaf 'Urlaub' (Wilhelm Horn), p. 252.

A Goethe Poem and Carlyle's Translation (C. O. Parsons), pp. 252-53.
An unpublished quatrain in the National Library of Scotland.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXII.
October 1933—

The Bible as Poetry in the English Renaissance: An Introduction
(Israel Baroway), pp. 447-80.

The Accusative and Dative of the Pronouns of the First and Second
Persons in Germanic (Alan S. C. Ross), pp. 481-82.

Germanic Etymologies (G. S. Lane), pp. 483-87.
N.E. cut.

The Method of Barclay's Eclogues (J. R. Schultz), pp. 549-71.

LIBRARY, Vol. XIV., December 1933—

John Wolfe, Printer and Publisher, 1579-1601 (H. R. Hoppe),
pp. 241-88.

Architectural Design on English Title-pages (Warren H. Smith),
pp. 289-98.

Dives et Pauper (H. G. Pfander), pp. 299-312.

Unrecorded MS. in the Bodleian; evidence of authorship.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 249

Thomas Heywood's Play on "The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth"
(G. N. Giordano-Orsini), pp. 313-38.

Newcome's Academy and its Plays (E. Alfred Jones), pp. 339-47.
Programmes and other documents in the Hackney Central Library.

The Bibliographical Approach to Shakespeare. Notes on New
Contributions (A. W. Pollard), pp. 348-52.

The Scribal Errors of the MS. Cotton Nero A. x. (J. P. Oakden),
pp. 353-58.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLVIII., December 1933—

New Documentary Evidence concerning Chaucer's Mission to
Lombardy (Haldeen Braddy), pp. 507-11.

Writ in the Exchequer Accounts.

A Possible Source of Chaucer's *Booke of the Duchesse—Li Regret de
Guillaume* by Jehan de la Mote (Constance L. Rosenthal),
pp. 511-14.

Chaucer's 'Book of the Twenty-Five Ladies' (Eleanor P. Hammond),
pp. 514-16.

Twenty-five or nineteen?

The Owl and the Nightingale and MS. Cotton (J. E. Wells), pp. 116-19.
Evidence of date.

'Scribal Preference' in the Old English Gloss to the *Lindisfarne
Gospels* (A. S. C. Ross), pp. 519-21.

The *N.E.D.*: Words of Divination and Onomatopœic Terms (E. B.
Dike), pp. 521-25.

New Evidence for Middle English *þef* (G. H. Gerould), pp. 525-27.

In the Latin Life of Waltheof, Abbot of Melrose.

As Good Chepe (Thomas A. Kirby), pp. 527-28.

Note on *Troilus and Criseyde*, iii, 641.

Some Blank Verses Written by Thomas Norton before *Gorboduc*
(Howard Baker), pp. 529-30.

Quotations from Virgil in the translation of Calvin's *Institutes*.

Revision in Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* (J. W. Ashton),
pp. 531-37.

The Hoe-Huntington Folio of Jonson (George W. Whiting),
pp. 537-38.

— Vol. XLIX., January 1934—

A Dramatic Skit by Dante Gabriel Rossetti (M. L. Howe), pp. 39-44.

In an unpublished letter to William Allingham, in reference to his painting
Found.

Paradise Lost, I, 549-62 (Fred L. Jones), pp. 44-45.

Plutarch's "Life of Lycurgus" as source.

Milton's Seasonal Inspiration (Edward S. Parsons), p. 46.

Parallel with Cowper.

"Letter to C— W." (Brice Harris), pp. 46-47.

"To Captain Warcup" in Harvard copy.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, February—

The Framing Tale (H. B. Hinckley), pp. 69-80.

Chaucer and some predecessors.

Chaucer and the *Pervigilium Veneris* (J. E. Hankins), pp. 80-83.

"Allas! Allas! That Ever Love Was Sinne!" (E. E. Slaughter), pp. 83-86.

St. Jerome and the Wife of Bath.

Chaucer's Age and the Prologues to the Legend (Thelma Kaut), p. 87.

A Note on Noah's Wife (Katherine Garvin), pp. 88-90.

Origin of the legend: illustration of the Caedmonian *Genesis*.

Lydgate's "The Churl and the Bird," MS. Harley 2407, and Elias Ashmole (R. H. Bowers), pp. 90-94.

Variant texts.

Note on Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* vi, 12, and vi, 15 (Jacob Hammer), pp. 94-95.

Should There be Any Plurals in 'oes'? (Henshaw Ward), pp. 95-98.

'Stir' and 'Chive' (J. L. Kuethe), pp. 98-99.

Early Eighteenth-Century Literary Relations between England and Germany (D. C. Allen), pp. 99-101.

References in an oration by J. B. Menken in 1713.

The Date of Composition of *The Borderers* (J. R. MacGillivray), pp. 104-11.

Evidence for 1796-1797.

Another Source of the "Lonesome Road" Stanza in *The Ancient Mariner* (E. G. Ainsworth, Jr.), pp. 111-12.

Blair's *Grave*, 55-70.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXIX., January 1934—

Passing Pitefull Hexameters (G. D. Willcock), pp. 1-19.

A Study of Quantity and Accent in English Renaissance Verse.

The Theme of *Timon of Athens* (J. W. Draper), pp. 20-31.

Two Queries on *Twelfth Night* (Bruce Dickinson), p. 67.

i. iii. 92 ff.; ii. iii. 22 ff.

A Note on *Troilus*, II. 1298 (T. A. Kirby), pp. 67-68.

Printed Books with Gabriel Harvey's Autograph or MS. Notes (G. C. Moore Smith), pp. 68-70.

Audra: *Les Traductions Françaises de Pope*, 1717-1825 (F. Beckwith), pp. 70-72.

Addenda, mainly from the Leeds University Library.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXI., November 1933—

Geoffrey and King Arthur in *Normannicus Draco* (J. S. P. Tatlock), pp. 113-25.

The Quarto of *King Lear* and Shorthand (J. Quincy Adams), pp. 135-63.

Evidence in favour of Bright's Characterie; actors' alterations of Shakespeare's lines.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 251

William Painter and the Vogue of Chaucer as a Moral Teacher
(L. B. Wright), pp. 165-74.

Copy of *Chaucer new Painted* in the Huntington Library.

The Question of Autobiographical Significance in *L'Allegro* and
Il Penseroso (D. C. Dorian), pp. 175-82.

Goldsmith and the *Annual Register* (R. W. Seitz), pp. 183-94.
Borrowings and adaptations.

The House of Fame and Renaud de Beaujeu's *Li Biaus Descouneüs*
(B. J. Whiting), pp. 196-98.

Parallel to Chaucer's description of the castle of Fame.

Verses found at Coughton Court (Edith Rickert), pp. 198-99.

On membrane of a court roll, c. 1500.

The Source of Arnold's Jacopone Sonnet (E. H. Wilkins), pp. 200-02.
Ozanam's *Les Poetes franciscains en Italie*.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 165, November 4, 1933—

Sir Walter Scott and Bishop Percy (William Ruff), pp. 308-09.

Unpublished letter to Percy, October 6, 1800.

— November 11—

Thomas Shelton's 'Tachygraphy' (W. J. Carlton), pp. 326-27.

Bibliographical note.

— November 18—

The *Mercurius Bellicus* of 1643 (H. H. Weber), pp. 345-47.

"Hannibal Scratchy" in Browning's *Pippa Passes* (A. C. Howell),
p. 351.

Use of name in *Joseph Andrews*.

— November 25—

Henry Carey and an XVIII Century Satire on Matrimony (F. T.
Wood), pp. 363-68.

Cupid and Hymen, 1748.

Gray's *Elegy*: Classical Reminiscence (V. R.), p. 371.

— December 2—

"Understood Relations" (M. R. James), p. 380.

Note on *Macbeth*, III. iv. 124.

New Readings for a Letter of Keats (E. G. Fletcher), p. 385.

To Georgiana Keats, January 13, 1820.

— December 16—

The Authorship of the Ludlow Pamphlets (G. W. Whiting),
pp. 426-27.

Evidence of John Toland's authorship.

— Vol. 166, January 6, 1934—

Correspondence of John Tomlin (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 6-7.

Letters from Dickens.

Unlocated Letters of John Keats (J. H. Birss and L. A. Holman), p. 7.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XII., October 1933—

Notes towards Dating Fletcher's *Wit without Money* (Baldwin Maxwell), pp. 327-38.

Allusions to events of 1620.

The Date of *The Owl and the Nightingale*. Vivian's Legation (H. B. Hinckley), pp. 339-49.

Notes on *Othello* (Alfred Kelcy), pp. 360-76.

Milton and Chartism (Albert K. Stevens), pp. 377-88.

Influence on Chartist leaders.

Hugh Kelly: His Place in the Sentimental School (Mark Schorer), pp. 389-401.

Two Notes on the *Essay on Man* (George Sherburn), pp. 402-03.

Bolingbroke's 'Fragments'; *The Universal Prayer*.

A Recent Theory of the *Ludus Coventriae* (Albert C. Baugh), pp. 403-06.

The Old Testament Plays of *Ludus Coventriae* (F. M. Salter), pp. 406-9.

Confutation of theory of T. B. Clark (April, pp. 144-69).

Three Chaucer Allusions in Sixteenth Century Libraries (M. C. Linthicum), pp. 409-10.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLVIII., December 1933—

The Book of the Nativity of St. Cuthbert (Irene P. McKeehan), pp. 981-99.

Methods of the medieval hagiographer.

The Visit to the Perilous Castle: A Study of the Arthurian Modifications of an Irish Theme (R. S. Loomis), pp. 1000-35.

Middle English *Run* (Fritz Mezger), pp. 1036-40.

The Evolution of the Canterbury "Marriage Group" (Carleton Brown), pp. 1041-59.

Chaucer's re-arrangement of the Tales.

Female Prologues and Epilogues in English Plays (A. N. Wiley), pp. 1060-79.

Sir William Cornwallis's Use of Montaigne (Roger E. Bennett), pp. 1080-89.

The Style of Drummond of Hawthornden in its Relation to His Translations (Ruth C. Wallerstein), pp. 1090-1107.

Henry Vaughan and the Hermetic Philosophy (Wilson O. Clough), pp. 1108-30.

Swift and Some Earlier Satirists of Puritan Enthusiasm (Clarence M. Webster), pp. 1141-53.

James Buchanan and the Eighteenth Century Regulation of English Usage (Bert Emsley), pp. 1154-66.

The Sentimentalism of Goldsmith (W. F. Galloway, Jr.), pp. 1167-81.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

Poetic Hero-Worship in the Late Eighteenth Century (Ruth O. Rose),
pp. 1182-1202.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. XI., December 1933—

Le Britannisme de Rossetti (R. Las Vergnas), pp. 129-35.

SHAKESPEARE-JAHRBUCH, HERAUSGEGEBEN IM AUFTRAGE DER DEUTSCHEN

SHAKESPEARE-GESELLSCHAFT VON WOLFGANG KELLER. Bd. 67

(Neue Folge, VIII. Band) Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1931.

Die englische Reformation (H. Schöffler), pp. 7-20.

Die erste deutsche Aufführung des "König Lear" (W. Drews),
pp. 21-25.

Zur englischen Kurzschrift im Zeitalter Shakespeares. Das Jane-
Seager-Manuskript (W. Kraner), pp. 26-61.

A study, with facsimiles and text, of B. M. MS. Addl. 10,937, a transcript
of "The Divine Prophecies of the Ten Sibyls," in Bright's shorthand,
given to Elizabeth as a New Year's gift in 1589.

Hamlet: die Tragik der geöffneten Augen (H. Weichelt), pp. 62-5.

— Bd. 68 (Neue Folge, IX. Band), 1932—

Shakespeare-Aufführungen unter Goethes Leitung (W. Deetjen),
pp. 10-35.

Shakespeares Bild im Spiegel deutscher Dichtung (M. Hecker),
pp. 36-55.

Shakespeare und das Königtum (W. Clemen), pp. 56-79.

Komposition zweier Shakespearescher Dramenserien (J. Schlaf),
pp. 80-6.

Zur Shakespeare-Stenographie (Max Förster), pp. 87-102.

An important discussion of the possibility of shorthand transcription of
plays by Bright's system, with especial reference to the article by W.
Matthews on "Shorthand and the Bad Shakespeare Quartos" in *M.L.R.*,
xxvii. With facsimiles of Bright's "Characterie Table."

Notes on *The Comedy of Errors* (S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 103-24.

Discussions of textual points, generally with reference to possible mis-
readings of MS.

Some Details of Italian Local Colour in *Othello* (J. W. Draper),
pp. 125-7.

Otto Gildemeister und Shakespeare (K. Strickert), pp. 128-39.

Tagebuchaufzeichnungen Eduard Devrients über Darstellungen

Shakespearescher Rollen (F. Devrient), pp. 140-6.

Albert Bassermanns *Lear* (H. Richter), pp. 147-50.

— Bd. 69 (Neue Folge, X. Band)—

Individuum und Kosmos in Shakespeares Werken (M. Deutschbein),
pp. 6-26.

Die Technik des Dramas (W. Dilthey), pp. 27-60.

Das Fortleben des elisabethanischen Dramas in Zeitalter der Restaura-
tion (G. Froberg), pp. 61-86.

- Shakespeare's Rustic Servants (J. W. Draper), pp. 87-101.
 Zur Frage der dichterischen Zusammenarbeit (J. Schlaf), pp. 102-11.
 Shakespeare und das heutige deutsche Laienspiel (M. Luserke),
 pp. 112-20.
 Shakespeare und das Problem der Raumbühne (T. Hecht), pp. 121-30.
 Zum Bühnenproblem des "Cymbelin" (G. Göhler), pp. 131-65.

SPECULUM, Vol. IX., January 1934—

- Skelton's *Speculum Principis* (F. M. Salter), pp. 25-37.
 Text from MS. in the British Museum.
 The Story of the Magic Horn (E. K. Heller), pp. 38-50.
 Versions in English and other languages.
 Polemius Silvius, Bede, and the Names of the Months (C. W. Jones),
 pp. 50-56.
 John Drury and his English Writings (S. B. Meech), pp. 70-83.
 Early fifteenth century grammatical and didactic treatises; text and
 comment.
 Mary Chaucer's First Husband (J. M. Manly), pp. 86-88.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXI., January 1934—

- Tudor and Stuart Dramatizations of the Doctrines of Natural and
 Moral Philosophy (H. K. Russell), pp. 1-27.
 An Unnoted Caroline Dramatist (Alfred Harbage), pp. 28-36.
 Mildmay Fane, Earl of Westmoreland.
 A Late Seventeenth Century Milton Plagiarism (G. W. Whiting),
 pp. 37-50.
 A Letter from General Ludlow to Dr. Hollingworth, 1692.
 Horace Walpole and Shakespeare (Jess M. Stein), pp. 51-68.
 David Garrick as Critic (Dougald MacMillan), pp. 69-83.
 Wordsworth, *The Philanthropist*, and *Political Justice* (C. W. Roberts),
 pp. 84-91.
 Lamb and Milton (J. Milton French), pp. 92-103.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 2, 1933—

- John Webster (R. G. Howarth), p. 751.
 References to Webster as 'cartwright' ?
 A Dryden Allusion (E. Nungezer), p. 751.
 Exclusion of butchers from jury service.

— November 9—

- Some Textual Notes on *Lear* (W. W. Greg), p. 771.
 I. iv. 366; III. iv. 123; II. iv. 141-42. Note by A. R. Cripps, November 23,
 p. 840; reply by W. W. Greg, November 30, p. 856; further notes by
 A. R. Cripps and W. L. Lorimer, December 7, p. 878.
 The Rival Poet and the Youth of the Sonnets (B. H. Newdigate;
 Kathleen M. Constable), p. 774.
 Michael Drayton and Walter Aston; identification of Drayton's *Minerva*
 and *Meridian*. Further notes by B. H. Newdigate and Charles Strachey,
 November 16, p. 795.

Shelley's *Laon and Cythna* (Marcel Kessel), p. 774.

Errors in Peacock's account of the revision.

A Comment upon Nokes (A. N. Wiley), p. 774.

Robert Heath's epigram, 1650.

'Pure Serene' (Carl Niemeyer), p. 774.

Use of phrase by Patrick Brontë.

Fragment of Keats Letter (J. H. Birss), p. 774.

Quotation from letter to Haslam in auction catalogue of 1877.

November 16—

Peter Simple (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 795.

Notes on sources and date of writing.

Shelley at Oxford (Newman I. White), p. 795.

Account in the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, 1812.

November 23—

Woodes's *Conflict of Conscience* (Celesta Wine), p. 840.

Woodes's source: Aglionby's translation of Gribalde's Epistle.

November 30—

Goldsmith in France (W. Roberts), p. 855.

Growth of his reputation. Further note, December 28, p. 921.

"These Late Eclipses" (G. B. Harrison), p. 856.

Prodigies described in pamphlet of 1606. Note by B. M. Ward, December 7, p. 878; replies by G. B. Harrison and D. C. Collins, December 14, p. 896; by B. M. Ward, December 21, p. 909; by D. C. Collins, B. M. Ward, H. H. Holland, and G. B. Harrison, January 4, p. 12.

December 7—

A Ballad of Lady Jane Grey (Ruth Hughey), p. 878.

Location of the only known copy. Note by Hyder E. Rollins, January 11, p. 28.

A Pepys Exhibition (Edwin Chappell), p. 878.

Correction of misstatements.

Robert Bridges, p. 884.

Bibliographical. Note by C. H. Wilkinson, December 28, p. 924.

December 14—

The Text of George Herbert (John Sparrow), p. 896.

Reply to Mr. Bernard Hall's suggestions.

December 21—

Romantic (W. Lee Ustick), p. 909.

Early uses of the word. Note by C. T. Onions, January 4, p. 12.

Ambrose Phillips (W. G. D. Fletcher), p. 909.

Biographical details from Shrewsbury registers. Note by Mary Segar, January 4, p. 12.

William Wordsworth and the Camden Society (J. M. Purcell), p. 909.

Record of membership. Notes by A. E. Stamp, December 28, p. 921; by Edith J. Morley, January 4, p. 12.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 28—

The Supplement to N.E.D. (George G. Loane), p. 921.
Some omissions.

Shakespeare's Company (Karl G. Pfeiffer), p. 921.

Date of enlargement to twelve members.

John Macrone, Charles Dickens and *The Thief* (Michael Sadleir),
p. 924.

Bibliographical. Note by F. J. Harvey Darton, January 4, p. 16.

January 4, 1934—

Jane Austen : Resemblances (Abby L. Talmadge), p. 12.

Parallels in Maria Edgeworth and Fanny Burney.

January 11—

Spenser's Allegories (E. Buyssens), p. 28.

Allegory based on Calvin's *Institution Chrétienne*.

A Line in *Lycidas* (James A. S. Barrett), p. 28.

L. 22. Further note by G. M. Gathorne-Hardy, January 18, p. 44.

The Duel in *Hamlet* (E. B. Goodacre), p. 28.

Replies by J. Dover Wilson, January 18, p. 44 ; by Evan John, January 25,
p. 60.

This Nook-Shotten Isle (W. Lee Ustick), p. 28.

Verstegan's use of 'nook.'

Joseph Ritson (B. H. Bronson), p. 28.

Record of marriage ?

January 18—

George Stoddard (S. H. Atkins), p. 44.

References in Lodge's *Satires*.

January 25—

The 'Mortal Moon' Sonnet (E. K. Chambers), p. 60.

Misdating of Camden's letter referring to Queen Elizabeth's illness.

The Mummings' Play (R. Crompton Rhodes), p. 60.

Early versions.

A Shakespeare Crux (William J. Griffin), p. 60.

A Midsummer Night's Dream, 1. ii. 100.

Raleigh's *History of the World* (W. B. Dukes), p. 60.

Erasures and alterations in the title-page.

leir),

y 25,